THE CAMBRIDGE ANCIENT HISTORY

EDITED BY

J. B. BURY, M.A., F.B.A.
S. A. COOK, LITT.D.
F. E. ADCOCK, M.A.

VOLUME II

THE EGYPTIAN AND HITTITE EMPIRES

TO *c.* 1000 B.C.

CAMBRIDGE
AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS
1931

PAGE
IV. Outline of history from fourteenth to eleventh century . . 318
Decline of Hatti and Egypt 320
V. Relations with Egypt 321
The Egyptian administration 322
Semitic officials in the Egyptian service 323
Messenger service 325
Satire of a scribe 326
Intercourse with Egypt 328
Material culture in Syria 329
VI. Language and writing 330
Current languages 331
Knowledge of Babylonian 333
Use of the cuneiform script 334
Records of letters, messengers, etc. 335
VII. Style and ideas 336
Style of the Amarna letters 337
Parallels in the O.T. 338
The Pharaoh and the gods 340
Religious and related ideas 343
VIII. The Deities 345
Native gods of Palestine 347
Astarte, Addu, Baal, Yahweh 348
Tendencies to monolatry 350
Absence of Yahweh-worship 351

CHAPTER XIV

THE RISE OF ISRAEL

By S. A. Cook

I. The Old Testament Narrative 352
The Biblical history 353
Its general character 355
Scanty external confirmation 356
II. The account of the Exodus and the Conquest 358
The patriarchs as settlers 359
Variant traditions of Exodus and Conquest 360
Moses and Aaron 362
The Kadesh traditions 365
Edomite and Israelite interrelations 367
III. The account of the rise of the Monarchy 369
The prelude to its rise 370
Conflicting traditions 371
Traditions of Saul and David 372
Complexity of the traditions 374
IV. Palestine, Phoenicia and the Philistines 376
Pre-Mitannian period 377
Rise of Phoenicia 378
Significance of Philistia 379

PAGE
V. Israel, Judah and King Saul 381
Tendencies of the Biblical history 383
Archaeology and criticism 384
The age of the 'Judges' 386
Importance of Shechem 387
Saul and his wars on the south 389
Relations between central and south Palestine 390
VI. David and Solomon 392
Judah and Edom 393
The Davidic idea 394
David, Solomon and Jerusalem. 396
VII. Some contemporary ideas 397
Ideas of 'righteousness' 398
Ikhnaton's reform and Palestine 399
Ideas of Right and Order. 400
Significance of the ideas of the period 402
The rise of Yahwism 404
Truth of idea rather than of fact 406

CHAPTER XV

THE CONTEMPORARY ART OF EGYPT AND THE NEAR EAST

By H. R. Hall

I. Historical development; architecture, sculpture, etc. 407
Relation between the New and the Middle Empire . . . 409
Sculpture of the XVIIIth Dynasty 410
Portraiture and caricature. 412
Funerary art: *ushabtis* and scarabs 414
II. Small art, costume, pottery, etc. 415
Scarabs, inlays 416
Glazes, glass 417
Carved ivory and wood 419
Costume and toilet 420
Textiles and leather-work. 423
Woodwork, pottery. 424
III. Syria and the East 426
Art in Syria, Cilicia and Cyprus 427
Hittite and Assyrian art 428
Later Assyrian art 430

CHAPTER XVI

CRETE AND MYCENAE

By A. J. B. Wace, M.A.
Deputy Keeper in the Victoria and Albert Museum; sometime Director of the British School of Archaeology at Athens; formerly Fellow of Pembroke College, Cambridge

I. Crete: Late Minoan I 431
Palaces of Cnossus and Phaestus 432
Minoan art 434

CHAPTER XIV

THE RISE OF ISRAEL

I. THE OLD TESTAMENT NARRATIVE

BY the close of the second millenium B.C. a number of minor independent states had made their appearance in Syria and Palestine. Some important Phoenician and Aramaean settlements are found in the north; then, Israel, Judah and various Philistine cities on the west of the Jordan, and, on its east, Gilead, Ammon and Moab; still farther south lies Edom with its connections reaching towards Egypt and north Arabia. Of these Israel and Judah especially attract attention on account of the part they are about to play in the religious history of south-west Asia. A united Hebrew monarchy arose, and became the type of greatness. But how it arose and what it meant have yet to be determined, for, although the O.T., practically our sole source, seems in a sense to contain the history of the Hebrews or Israelites, modern critical opinion can be summed up in the statement that: 'the O.T. does not furnish a history of Israel, though it supplies the materials from which such a history can be constructed[1].'

According to the traditions which came to prevail, Jacob (otherwise known as Israel) and his elder twin-brother Esau (or Edom) were grandsons of Abram (or Abraham) of Hebron in south Palestine. Their 'father' Isaac was associated with Beer-sheba, to the south of Hebron, and Abram's nephew, Lot, was 'father' of Moab and Ammon. Abram was thus the ancestor of the Hebrews, a wider term than 'Israel' (vol. I, pp. 185, 233). In response to the summons of Yahweh he entered Canaan, and journeyed from Shechem to Bethel, and thence to the south. Later, Jacob left his father and brother, settled among Aramaeans (apparently south of Damascus), and after some years re-entered with the sons of his Aramaean wives, settling first at Shechem and then in the south. Driven into Egypt by a famine the family was protected by a friendly Pharaoh; but under a later hostile monarch the 'Children of Israel'—for the family has now become a number

[1] W. Robertson Smith, Preface to Wellhausen's *Prolegomena to the History of Israel* (1885), p. vii. See the qualification, p. 356, n. 1, below.

of interrelated tribes—suffered grievous oppression. Moses, a fugitive from justice, feeding the flock of his father-in-law, Jethro (in one version the priest of Midian), was raised up by Yahweh to deliver his people, and with his brother Aaron headed the exodus from the 'house of slaves.' After a series of signs and wonders culminating in the miraculous crossing of the Red Sea, Israel escaped and marched to Sinai, or Horeb, the scene of a solemn covenant between Yahweh and the people, and the occasion for the promulgation of various religious, legal and other institutions for the future. It is here that we have the inauguration of Mosaism or Judaism, the foundation of all subsequent Jewish belief and practice.

Men were sent to spy out Palestine; but the Israelites, terrified at their report, were doomed to spend forty years in the wilderness until all the adults had died off (Num. xiv, 33; Deut. ii, 16). A new generation had the privilege of conquering the land promised to their fathers. After making a circuitous journey round by the head of the Gulf of Akabah and the east of the Dead Sea, Israel seized the territory east of the Jordan as far as Gilead and Hermon (Deut. iii, 8 *sqq.*). A second covenant was made by Moses, shortly before his death (Deut. xxix, 1, compared with v, 2). Led by Joshua, Israel at length crossed the Jordan, and at Gilgal the new generation submitted to the national rite of circumcision (Josh. v; cf. Gen. xvii). In due course they captured Jericho, Ai and presumably Bethel, and the men of Gibeon in alarm obtained an alliance by subterfuge. Jerusalem, Hebron, Jarmuth, Lachish and Eglon united, but were defeated; and Joshua took Libnah, Gezer and Debir (or Kirjath-Sepher), smiting southern Palestine, 'from Kadesh-Barnea unto Gaza and all the land of Goshen, even unto Gibeon[1].' In the north Joshua defeated another alliance involving cities from the *hinterland* of Dor to the south of Lake Chinnereth (Gennesaret), and won the land as far as Lebanon and Mt Hermon. Arrangements were made to divide the land west of the Jordan among the tribes, although much still remained to be taken (Josh. xiii). Soon after a solemn assembly of the people and a third covenant (at Shechem) Joshua died, and there arose

[1] Josh. x, 41. The name Jarmuth resembles the Yarimuta of the Amarna letters (p. 324). It should be noticed that the *j* in biblical names should properly be *y* (yĕrīkhoh, yĕhōshūa, etc.); the English *j* is not found in Hebrew. Jehovah, however, should not be Yehovah or Yehowah, because the vowels of *Ădōnāy* ('lord') have been applied to the consonants of the Ineffable Name (in the English Bible 'Lord'), the original pronunciation of which may have been Yahweh. See vol. I, p. 185, note.

another generation that knew not Yahweh, nor what he had wrought for Israel (Judg. ii, 10).

Thus Yahweh became the God of Israel, and Israel the people of Yahweh in his land. But the tables were now quickly turned. The Israelites newly settled began to suffer from surrounding tribes and raiders, and from still unconquered Canaanites and other peoples of Palestine. There were alternating periods, first of apostasy and suffering, and then of deliverance, when a 'judge' arose, or was raised up to save Yahweh's people. The early unity of Israel seems destroyed, but an ancient poem of the victory over Sisera and the Canaanites shows that the tribes could combine; though some were apathetic, and Judah is conspicuously absent (Judg. v). We reach the age of the Philistine oppression: the boisterous Samson of the tribe of Dan and the prophet Samuel of Ephraim are—apart from the unknown Shamgar, the son of Anath—the first great saviours, and also 'judges' of widely different types. Saul founded the monarchy, and of this there are two distinct versions: (*a*) he was divinely chosen to deliver Israel from the Philistine occupation (1 Sam. ix, xiii); and (*b*) the people, saved by Samuel from the Philistines, demanded a king, a demand which was offensive, because Yahweh was king (viii, x, 17 *sqq.*, xii). The two versions conflict absolutely. Throughout, the history is written from a religious standpoint; and Saul, barely appointed king, is condemned by Yahweh, and the young David of Bethlehem selected in his stead. To Saul notable conquests are however ascribed (1 Sam. xiv, 47–51), and an old poem, cited from the book of Jashar, sings his praise (2 Sam. i). After a brief reign he was overwhelmed by the Philistines at Mt Gilboa, and it remained for David to reconquer them and free Israel. Anointed king of Judah at Hebron, David moved north, fighting Philistines and capturing Jerusalem from the hand of the Jebusites (*c.* 1000 B.C.). He made it his capital, subdued all the neighbouring peoples, and proposed to build the temple. The temple of Jerusalem is the great climax towards which the religious history of the people had been moving. The work was taken in hand and completed by his son Solomon, to whom are ascribed a powerful and extensive kingdom, enormous wealth, and profound wisdom and piety. But cracks in the edifice were already visible, and at his death north and south fell apart, and the separate kingdoms of Israel and Judah entered upon their lengthy history (*c.* 932 B.C.). They remained implacable rivals, for the north forsook Jerusalem and its temple; and later, when the northern tribes were exiled (eighth century B.C.), and a mixed

Samaritan community took their place, Judah felt herself to be the sole heir of the old Israel.

Thus, the united monarchy was of relatively brief duration, although at one time or another the north or the south was able to exercise very considerable influence over its neighbour. But it is to be observed that the name 'Israel' is used to denote (1) all the tribes (the 'sons' of Jacob) before the separation, (2) the northern tribes, either as distinct from an independent Judah, or with the inclusion of a subordinate Judah, and (3) the later Judah who would not recognize the legitimacy of the mixed community to the north. This complicates the study of the sources, and it has been necessary to refer to the later periods because there is good reason to believe that the accounts of the earlier period are not contemporary, but represent later traditions and standpoints, when the rivalry of Judah and Israel was familiar. Indeed it is not until we come to the later history that we can recognize some of the political and religious vicissitudes which have at least helped to shape the accounts in question.

The space given to the early history in the O.T. is, in itself, an indication of the significance it had for later ages, and of the anxiety to find in the distant past the foundations of the present. The conception of history as there displayed becomes the only orthodox one; see the brief summary in Deut. xxvi, 5–10. Under the influence of a religious enthusiasm there had been a mighty invasion—the conquests of Islam may be compared. Tribes were knit together to conquer the land promised to their ancestors, and it is entirely natural that, as the enthusiasm died down, and as they passed from nomad or semi-nomad to settled conditions, there should have been some disintegration, some relaxation of religious discipline (most notably illustrated in the book of Judges), and the need for that stimulus of the prophetic figures so characteristic of the biblical story.

There is much in the history that is entirely in accordance with all that is known from external and contemporary sources. Palestine suffered from more than one invasion and settlement of foreigners, especially from the desert; tribes entered Egyptian territory to pasture; and there are many details in the Pentateuch and other portions of the O.T. which show a good knowledge of Egyptian conditions. The name Moses is Egyptian, and appears in Thutmose ('[the god] Thut is born')[1]. Phinehas is 'the negro,' the Nubian; and Moses had a Cushite wife. The story of Joseph —who married an Egyptian wife—has several Egyptian traits.

[1] F. Ll. Griffith, in C. F. Burney, *Schweich Lectures* (1917), p. 47 n.

So, too, in Joshua's campaigns there is much that on topographical and even on military grounds is in itself perfectly credible. On the other hand, close examination reveals throughout serious discrepancies of historical background, range of interest, and religious spirit, such that the constituent elements cannot be due to one age or one circle. Modern biblical criticism rests partly upon numerous internal difficulties in the Pentateuch itself, partly also on the impossibility of understanding it if, in its present form, it is earlier than the great prophets whose teaching transformed Israel and her history. Briefly, the 'critical theory' amounts to this, that the highly-developed history, law, and ritual are, *in their present form*, of post-exilic date, that is, after the sixth century B.C., and that the Pentateuch (together with the book of Joshua) consists of much that is of exilic or post-exilic date, together with much that is earlier. Owing to the nature of the problem, opinions differ as to the precise dates of the constituent elements and of their historical value; but although many serious questions remain, the essential conclusion is that the early history of Israel, as it is impressed upon the reader in the O.T., is the last stage in a very complicated process. It is necessary, however, that the reader should know something of the evidence upon which some important conclusions have been based, although an adequate discussion would be much too technical for these pages[1]. See also pp. 375, 383 *sqq*.

In the first place, there are no direct references in contemporary sources, either to the Exodus or to the Conquest[2]. The events in the Amarna letters cannot be identified with Joshua's invasion from the south without entirely stultifying the biblical narrative. The Habiru, who are mentioned only in Abdi-Khiba's letters from Jerusalem, are evidently the *Sa.Gaz*, who are found also in the north with Abd-Ashirta, and can scarcely be the

[1] While the strongest arguments against the 'critical' position have indicated the weakness of *elaborate* 'reconstructions' based upon data which prove to be much more complicated than was thought, no alternative position and no other fruitful lines of enquiry have attracted serious attention.

[2] Four groups of theories have prevailed as to the Exodus. Broadly speaking, they associate themselves with (1) the Hyksos (*i.e. before* the XVIIIth Dynasty), (2) the age of Thutmose III and Amenhotep III and IV (the 'Amarna Age,' XVIIIth Dynasty); (3) the age of Ramses II and Merneptah (XIXth Dynasty); and (4) a later period (XXth Dynasty). Each of the groups has points in its favour, but deals so drastically with the biblical evidence that should any one of them be justified (through fresh external evidence), the very secondary character of the biblical narratives will only be more unmistakable. Most can be said in favour of (2) and (3); cf. p. 153 *sq*.

Israelites under Joshua. There is no agreement between the letters and the O.T. as regards the names of the kings of Jerusalem (Abdi-Khiba—Adoni-Zedek), Lachish (Yabniel, Zimrida—Yaphia), Gezer (Yapakhi [Yaphia]—Horam), and Hazor (Abdi-Tirshi—Yabin). Moreover, people were being sold for food to Yarimuta; and were actually fleeing for refuge to Egypt, where Syrian (Palestinian) officials, like Yankhamu and Dudu, could hold high positions. Palestine was still under Egyptian administration in the time of Ramses III; and not only is there no hint of this in the O.T., but the Canaanites or Amorites are there represented as independent. The divergence between the conditions as described in the O.T. and the contemporary evidence (see chap. XIII) is crucial. Nor can we find any contact later. If Israel built Pithom and Raamses in the time of Ramses II (Ex. i, 11: see above, p. 152 *sq.*), Merneptah's reference to Israel might seem to suggest that the Exodus had meanwhile intervened (p. 165 *sq.*). Yet, even if Israel had availed itself of the Libyan invasion of Egypt, and had fled from bondage into the southern wilderness, or even into Palestine, nomads (*Shasu*) were peacefully entering Egypt for pasturage, and the narratives hardly reflect Merneptah's age. If the foreign *Aperu*, who were employed as labourers as late as the days of Ramses III, are Hebrews (p. 328), they must have remained behind (although a mixed multitude went up, Ex. xii, 38)—to suppose that the Exodus had not yet taken place is against the chronology. The chronological details, however, are in any case inconclusive (vol. I, p. 163 *sq.*).

The significant facts are: (*a*) the persistence and depth of Egyptian influence upon Palestine even in the thirteenth century B.C., (*b*) the early occurrence of the name of the Israelite tribal-district Asher (p. 319), and of such names as Jacob and Abram (vol. I, pp. 233, 236); (*c*) the serious discrepancies between the O.T. and the external events, whatever view be taken of the date of the Exodus and the Conquest; and (*d*) the parallels between the culture illustrated in the Amarna letters, etc., and that of even the later books of the O.T. In fact, the excavations manifest no break in the cultural conditions such as there would have been had the Israelite invasion and conquest taken the form the narratives involve. The book of Genesis itself implies that there were Hebrews before there were Israelites; and since the Habiru movement could hardly, at the best, represent even the *first* Hebrew invasion—and there is nothing to identify it clearly with any event in Genesis—it must be concluded that the biblical narratives certainly represent traditions of various movements,

but that their actual character is a matter of conjecture. Some co-ordination of Egyptian and Palestinian (Judaean) history may be recognized in the notice of the relative antiquity of Tanis and Hebron (Num. xiii, 22). But how tradition and good history could be fused is sufficiently illustrated in the late Greek accounts of the expulsion of the Hyksos, especially if, as is still sometimes urged, the account of the Exodus represents the biblical version of this event (vol. I, p. 311). In a word, it becomes generally true that although we may assume that the O.T. narratives reflect some knowledge of invasions and other movements, and although there is external evidence for important movements (cf. also the time of Seti I, p. 135 above), the biblical accounts, as they stand, cannot be used by the historian.

II. THE ACCOUNT OF THE EXODUS AND THE CONQUEST

As the composite O.T. record now reads, the *family* of Jacob (Israel) went down into Egypt: the list (Gen. xlvi) corresponds in general to that of the chief divisions of the Israelite *tribes*, the 'children of Israel' (Num. xxvi). An uncertain period intervenes, although Joseph, who went down as a youth, and lived 110 years, is said to have seen the children of Machir who occupied Gilead and received it from the hands of Moses (Gen. l, 23; Num. xxxii; vol. I, p. 163). Jacob died after seventeen years in Egypt, and a large company set out to bury him, but returned again (Gen. l). The 600,000 *men* of the Exodus itself (Ex. xii, 37)—not to mention the 'mixed multitude'—would point to a grand total of some two millions of Israelites: this is among the many real difficulties in the account of the Exodus and the life in the wilderness, and Doughty observes that the convoy of Israel would be more than 200 leagues long. If we reduce the figures—and in one account there are only two Hebrew midwives in Exodus (Ex. i, 15; cf. *v.* 10, the fear lest the people multiply)—the result is to destroy the effect of the whole narrative, especially of the conquest of Palestine. On the other hand, it is far from unlikely that the historical kernel is the descent and exodus of some relatively small band, perhaps, as is often thought, of a few tribes; and the first significant conclusion is that *not all Israel went down into Egypt and returned*: the original tradition must have been considerably reshaped.

Further, according to one version Jacob's family settled, not in and among the Egyptians, whom they despoiled when they left (cf. Ex. iii, 22, etc.), but apart, as shepherds, in the land of

Goshen (cf. viii, 22; ix, 26; x, 23). Goshen in Egypt (? by the Wadi Ṭumīlāt) has not been finally identified; and another Goshen is mentioned with Kadesh and Gaza in the south of Palestine (Josh. x, 41; xi, 16). This Goshen is in the vicinity of the 'River of Egypt' (the Wadi el-Arīsh), about 50 miles south-west of Gaza, and when Hagar, Abraham's concubine, and the 'mother' of Ishmael, is associated with the district, and is also called an 'Egyptian,' we have a noteworthy extension of the name Egypt, similar to the 'wilderness of the land of Egypt,' where Ezekiel evidently located the wanderings of the Israelites (xx, 36). Hence, it is also noteworthy that in three interrelated stories (*a*) Abram and his wife Sarai descend into Egypt to escape a famine, and the Pharaoh is plagued; (*b*) Abraham and his wife Sarah journey to Abimelech, in Gerar between Kadesh and Shur, and Abimelech suffers; and (*c*) Isaac and Rebekah, also to escape famine, go down to Abimelech, 'king of the Philistines,' in the district of Gerar and Beer-sheba (Gen. xii, xx, xxvi). In these circumstances we may conclude that traditions of an exodus from Egypt proper may well have been influenced by those of *some movement into Palestine from the eastern extension of Egypt*, a district here closely associated with the Philistines.

In the account of the entrance of Jacob-Israel with his Aramaean wives (see p. 369 *sq.*) there are traditions of an actual settlement; and these, in common with the tribal genealogies in 1 Chronicles (ii *sqq.*), ignore, and sometimes exclude, a descent into Egypt and an exodus (*ib.* vii, 20 *sqq.*). Jacob, it was said, bought ground at Shechem; indeed, he conquered the city, and had pasturing-grounds in the vicinity (Gen. xxxiii, 19; xxxvii, 12; xlviii, 22). Of this conquest later fancy has much to say, although it obviously conflicts with the tendency of the biblical narratives. But the story of Jacob's daughter, Dinah, and of Shechem, the 'son' of Hamor, is also that of some settlement; and Simeon and Levi are sternly condemned for their ferocity (xxxiv, 30; cf. xlix, 5–7): the original story has apparently been amplified to embrace all the tribes of Israel. The tribal fortunes of Reuben, too, are ostensibly determined by his incest (1 Chron. v, 1). Judah's marriage with the Canaanite (xxxviii) finds a parallel in that of Simeon (xlvi, 10), whose wife, according to a very late, but entirely consistent, tradition, was of Zephath (Jubilees xxxiv, 20; xliv, 33), the city taken by Simeon and Judah and renamed Hormah at the conquest under Joshua (Judg. i, 17). Such traditions of the 'patriarchs' and their deeds allow no room for any account of a sojourn in Egypt and an exodus; and they presuppose some

considerable body of tradition which has disappeared in favour of the now prevailing outline. This is the third significant conclusion, and it agrees with the view suggested by a general survey of the O.T. narrative: *not all the Hebrews or Israelites went down into Egypt; those who remained in the land would have traditions of settlement very different from those who took part in the Exodus; and of these traditions Genesis preserves fragments.*

The entrance of Abram to Shechem and his journey to Bethel and Hebron (p. 352) find a parallel in the steps of Jacob. The separation of each from Lot and Esau (Edom) respectively is also similar (Gen. xiii, 6; xxxvi, 6 *sq.*); and the two events, together with the line drawn between Isaac and Hagar (and Ishmael), represent *either*, three distinct occurrences in pre-Mosaic history *or*—more naturally—explanations of the difference felt, at different times, between Hebrews (or Israelites) and other groups, all of which, as the genealogical lists and topographical details prove, were very closely interconnected. Finally, there are striking parallels between the entrance of Jacob and his 'sons' and that of the Israelite tribes. Shechem is the scene of Joshua's great religious assembly before the dismissal of the tribes, and of Jacob's reforms before leaving for Bethel (Gen. xxxv, 1–5; Josh. xxiv). The 'house of Joseph' proceeds to Bethel, where the 'weeping' of Israel at Bochim finds its parallel in the 'oak of weeping,' also near Bethel (Judg. ii, 1–5; Gen. xxxv, 8). Judah and Simeon were the first to conquer the land allotted to them (Judg. i); and, while Judah 'at that time' departs and settles among the Canaanites (Gen. xxxviii, 1), the Canaanite alliances of Judah and Simeon have already been noticed. The similarities are too close to be accidental, and we may infer that *the original stories of the patriarchs did not lead up to the account of the Exodus and the Conquest.* The stories describe how the patriarchal figures come to be settled in the south: they represent a specifically South Palestinian point of view. The story of Joseph, it should be noticed, serves to combine traditions of settlement with those of a descent; it is the logical prelude to an exodus from Egypt and a conquest of the Promised Land. But the Egyptian names in it take us down to a much later age; and if the story has been used to connect the two groups of traditions, it is noteworthy that the account of Abram's descent into Egypt also breaks the main narrative[1].

[1] Gen. xii, 8 *sq.* compared with xiii, 3 *sq.* Not only is Joseph connected by marriage with the priesthood of Heliopolis (Gen. xli, 45), but the priesthood of Shiloh (Eli, etc.) is also traced back to Egypt (1 Sam. ii, 27, below, p. 371): some close connection between Egypt (proper) and Central Palestine stands out clearly in the traditions.

The history of Israel before the entrance into Palestine is viewed as a time of innocence (Jer. ii, 2 *sqq.*; Hosea ii, 15; ix, 10), a simple existence devoid of complex ritual (Amos v, 25); but by Ezekiel (xx) it is regarded as one long period of guilt. Sinai or Horeb—the present narratives seem to identify them—is the chief scene, but a closer examination of the details hardly confirms this. We read that food must be miraculously provided (Ex. xvi, Num. xi) although the people possessed cattle (Ex. xvii, 3; xix, 13; Num. xx, 4, 19, etc.). Not only are the two accounts of the provision of quails and manna parallel, but that in Exodus (xvi, 9–33) hints at the existence of the ark and sanctuary, and presupposes a later position in the narrative, after, and not before Sinai. Also, it alludes to a testing (*v.* 4), which at once points to the place Massah, the name of which means 'proving, tempting' (Deut. vi, 16, ix, 22). Moreover, the provision of water at the rock of the waters of Meribah ('strife, contention') is not at Sinai, but Kadesh (Num. xx, 1–14; xxvii, 14); and it finds a parallel in the miracle at the rock of Massah and Meribah (Ex. xvii, 1–7), which likewise is out of place before Sinai. Again, the Amalekites, defeated by Joshua, belong more naturally to south Palestine than to the Sinaitic peninsula, and to a later period, after the introduction of the young Joshua in Ex. xxxiii, 11. Similarly, Jethro's visit to Moses and the inauguration of judges (Ex. xviii) point to a later stage (*v.* 5 refers to Sinai, which is not reached until xix), and with this agrees the summary in Deut. i, 9–18. That is to say, the account of the journey to Sinai from the 'Red Sea' ('Sea of Reeds'; the precise identification is uncertain) is built up of stories that belong to a later stage, and are, in part at least, connected with Kadesh—the 'Well of Judgment' (Gen. xiv, 7). It is noteworthy, therefore, that the statement of the passage from the 'Red Sea' to Shur and the waters of Marah refers to a 'proving' (cf. Massah, above), and suggests that Israel came direct to Kadesh (Ex. xv, 22 *sqq.*)—from Egypt. On the other hand, the natural routes from Egypt eastwards are (*a*) by the sea-coast to Gaza, (*b*) the caravan route to Beer-sheba and Hebron, leaving Kadesh on the south, and (*c*) the familiar route, south of Kadesh, to the Gulf of Akabah. This gulf itself is also called the 'Sea of Reeds' (1 Kings ix, 26), and to add to our difficulties Judg. xi, 16 speaks of the journey of Israel from Egypt *through the wilderness* to the 'Sea of Reeds'—evidently outside Egypt proper—and thence to Kadesh.

Now Kadesh (presumably '*Ain Kadīs*) lies about 50 miles south of Beer-sheba; the site of Sinai and Horeb, if they are really identical, is disputed. Many scholars argue strongly for the

traditional Jebel Mūsā, or, better, for Jebel Serbāl: both are in the south of the peninsula of Sinai. If so, Israel marched from Egypt into what was virtually an Egyptian dependency. But tribes from this district, or from the mines of the not distant Serabit el-Khadim, may have escaped into Palestine, and their tradition of a flight from this Egyptian dependency may have helped to develop the present narratives. Further, Jethro, the Midianite father-in-law of Moses, lived near Horeb (Ex. iii), and Midian may be located in north-west Arabia, where there are remains of once active volcanoes, such as might have formed the foundation of the very impressive scene at Mt Sinai (Ex. xix)[1]. It is true that Midian is a somewhat fluid term in the O.T. (extending from north Sinai round to the east of Moab); but it is a striking fact that some names of its divisions also appear in Judaean and Reubenite lists, and that there are some interesting points of similarity between O.T. cultus and that of the Minaeans, a colony of whom lived—though at an uncertain date—at el-Ŏlā in north Arabia. A movement into Palestine of Arabian tribes is not out of the question. Moreover, there were well-established routes between the head of the Gulf of Akabah, and both Egypt and Gaza, and also between the former and the region east of the Jordan. The view that Sinai-Horeb was near Kadesh would certainly remove some of the inconsistencies noted above; on the other hand, the statement that an eleven-days' journey separated them (Deut. i, 2) agrees with the fact that the father-in-law of Moses lived at some distance from the Israelite camp (Ex. xviii, 27; Num. x, 30), which, on other grounds, appears to have been at Kadesh. These and many other difficulties have not yet been adequately explained, and it is possible that separate traditions of Sinai and of Horeb were combined, and were introduced with the help of Ex. xiii, 17 *sq*. This passage explains that the people who left Egypt (proper) did not take the natural course direct into Palestine in order that they might avoid war, although this observation is really stultified in the present narratives by the subsequent story of the battle with the Amalekites (Ex. xvii).

The help rendered by the father-in-law of Moses (Ex. xviii) is otherwise initiated by Moses in Deut. i, 9 *sqq*.; and, when Moses requests his kinsman's company on the journey (Num. x, 29, here called Hobab) the sequel is lost, although he is found later in Judah (Judg. i). More weight is laid upon the presence of the ark (Num. x, 33), the pillar of cloud and fire (xiv, 14), the angel (Ex. xiv, 19; xxxii, 34), and the Divine Presence itself (xxxiii,

[1] Cf. Jebel Harāb (7710 feet), 36° long. east and 28° lat. north?

14). There are also obscure references to a hornet sent to prepare the way (Ex. xxiii, 28; Josh. xxiv, 12). The diffidence of Moses to undertake his great task is variously removed (Ex. xxxiii, Num. xi); and although the assistance of Aaron is promised at a very early stage (Ex. iv, 14), he plays only a secondary part in the older narratives. Again, the story of the appointment of seventy elders (Ex. xxxiii, but see already xxiv) breathes a fine catholicity; but it is marred when the two 'outsiders,' Eldad and Medad, who also receive the gift of the spirit—although they are not of the elect—are said to have been already on the register, and were therefore not entirely outside the pale. Other stories tell of supremacy (*e.g.* that of Moses over Miriam and Aaron, Num. xii); and the very composite story of Korah inculcates the supremacy of Levites over non-Levites, and of priestly over non-priestly Levites (Num. xvi). A distinction is also drawn between Nadab and Abihu, the (ritually) impious sons of Aaron himself and their brethren (Lev. x, with a play upon Kadesh, 'holy'). Here, once more, we are to recognize, *either* actual vicissitudes, similar, though with many subtle differences, *or* we may more naturally treat them as efforts to throw back to the traditional beginnings of Israelite national history various ecclesiastical vicissitudes, rivalries and developments which can also be traced in the post-exilic books of Chronicles and elsewhere. To the excessively complex religious and ecclesiastical developments in later Israelite history there correspond the intricate details in the narrative of the inauguration of Judaism.

Another striking example of this 'reflexion' is afforded by the story of the Golden Calf, for the construction of which Aaron was responsible, and nearly lost his life (Ex. xxxii; Deut. ix, 20). This cult was once orthodox in the northern kingdom, and its foundation is also ascribed to Jeroboam, the first king after (north) Israel broke away from Judah. Indeed, Jeroboam's sons are called Nadab and Abijah (cf. the names of Aaron's sons), and his words to the people are also those of Aaron, 'Behold thy gods, O Israel, which brought thee up out of the land of Egypt' (1 Kings xii, 28). It was on the occasion of this 'idolatry' that the Levites distinguished themselves by their fiery zeal and were consecrated. As the Levites are elsewhere blessed for their staunchness (Deut. xxxiii, 8 *sqq.*), the unfavourable attitude to the affair at Shechem (Gen. xlix, 5–7, above) will either refer to some earlier historical event (though no very satisfactory explanation has yet been found), or it represents quite another feeling touching the character of these zealots. In the latter case, we may compare the

widely divergent attitudes to the sanguinary reforms by the Rechabites at the second great landmark in north Israelite history, the rise of the dynasty of Jehu (see 2 Kings x, and Hosea i, 4). The story of the calf-worship, thus ascribed variously to the first king of the schismatic north, or to Aaron himself, leads on to the account of a new covenant. Moses in his wrath breaks the tables of the Decalogue, and when new ones are made and re-written, the narrative presents a series of laws more archaic in some respects and less ethical in others than the Decalogue itself (Ex. xx, xxxiv). The people now strip themselves of their jewels, not, as before, to make the calf, but for an unspecified reason (xxxiii, 6; cf. xxxii, 2). There follows, however, a fragment describing how Moses would pitch him a Tent, the Tent of Meeting, not the elaborate Tabernacle, the details of which have long been a stumbling-block to the credibility of the narratives, but a modest sanctuary, guarded, not by innumerable Levites, but by Joshua, who is here introduced as for the first time. It is not, like the Tabernacle, the central object of the national camp of all the Israelite tribes, but outside it (xxxiii, 7–11). It is introduced after Yahweh's refusal to accompany the erring people and before the promise of his 'presence.' It is apparently at this stage that the Ark was made, and the Tables placed in it (Deut. x)—though it is questioned whether this was its original purpose. Some more complete tradition must once have existed of this Tent and all its contents—and of the use made of the people's jewels—but it has been ignored in favour of the present detailed and late description of the gorgeous Tabernacle, as explained to Moses (Ex. xxv–xxxi) and as actually constructed (xxxv–xl), largely through the help of Bezalel, of the Judaean clan Caleb, and Aholiab the Danite (xxxi, 1–11).

The book of Leviticus is of ritual rather than of direct historical importance; and the opening chapters of Numbers deal, *inter alia*, with the preparations for the journey into Palestine. When at last this is undertaken, ostensibly from Sinai (Num. x, 29), we find the closest connection between Yahweh's commands and the complaints of Moses in Ex. xxxiii, 1–3 and Num. xi. 11–15. This is intelligible when we consider the nature of the intervening material, which has, in fact, broken the earlier thread. The scene, however, is not Sinai, but the wilderness of Paran (Sinai being left behind, Num. x, 12); it is approximately the ancient Edom, which stretched east and west between Palestine and the Sinaitic peninsula. The district in general is famous as the scene of great historic theophanies (Deut. xxxiii, 2; Judg. v, 4; Hab. iii, 3), and

of Elijah's visit to Horeb shortly before the rise of the dynasty of Jehu (1 Kings xix).

After the return of spies who had been sent into Palestine (from Kadesh, Num. xiii, 26)—the original story should preferably come before Num. xx, 14—the lack of faith of the Israelites is punished by the infliction of forty years of wandering in the district, and they are ordered to journey round by the head of the Gulf of Akabah. In defiance of Yahweh, and without the protection of Moses and the Sacred Ark (as in x, 35 *sq.*), an attempt was made to strike northwards. It led to a disastrous defeat, and Amalekites and Canaanites beat them back as far as Hormah (xiv). But elsewhere (xxi, 1–3) we read that Israel, after suffering defeat at the hands of the Canaanites (Arad, 50 miles north of Kadesh, is mentioned), utterly destroyed ('banned') them and their cities, with Yahweh's help, whence the origin of the name Hormah, 'ban.' This victory at the very gates of the Promised Land—Arad lies 17 miles south of Hebron—is of extreme importance because, as the story of the conquest now reads, the tribes Judah and Simeon, after the circuitous journey round by the east of the Dead Sea, entered under Joshua, and, moving south, ultimately took Zephath and called it Hormah (Judg. i), and in this district these tribes have their seat. The tribes practically describe a circle. Accordingly, not only are there different accounts of the seizure of the district of Hormah, but one of them really implies the tradition of a successful movement of Israel (or rather of some part of it) northwards into south Palestine, and is quite distinct from the tradition of the circuitous route, round by the Gulf of Akabah, for which, however, the story of the defeat at Hormah very naturally prepares the way.

There are discrepant traditions as to Kadesh and the scene of the years of wandering, whether before reaching Kadesh or after leaving it; and, just as the traditions of the Exodus of Egypt have been extended to include all Israel, so the fragment of the movement into south Palestine can hardly be true of all Israel, but only of certain elements which have yet to be determined. Kadesh (see p. 344, n. 1) lay at what was, at some period, the border of Israel and Edom (Josh. xv, 3; Num. xx, 16)—to the north are Amalekites and Canaanites, to the east Edom; and this representation, together with precise references to Edom, Moab and Ammon, point to a time when these and Israel were clearly understood as distinct entities. Edom violently refused to allow his 'brother' Israel to pass through—distinct 'brother' peoples

exist; but in another version Israel journeyed direct to Moab (Num. xx, 22–29; xxxiii, 37). Here there is no hostile feeling, for, just as Israel has his own land, so Yahweh had given Mt Seir to Esau (*i.e.* Edom, Deut. ii; xxiii, 7). Yet, as lists of caravan-stations are preserved, and as the route along the east of the fertile districts of Edom and Moab is that of the later pilgrim-road between Arabia and Syria, the tradition of an independent journey from some Midianite area in north Arabia may lie behind the present highly-complicated sources. Indeed we cannot ignore the possibility of a separation of tribes, and a twofold journey along the west and along the east of the Dead Sea. However, it must suffice to have mentioned some of the difficulties which have led scholars to attempt reconstructions of the early history.

Although Moab and Ammon are left untouched—because the children of Lot had received their land from Yahweh (Deut. ii, 9)—the story of Balaam, the son of Beor, who is associated with Aram (? read Edom), and also with Ammon (some versions in Num. xxii, 5), represents Moabite (and Midianite) hostility to Israel. Balaam, a worshipper of Yahweh (Num. xxii, 18), called upon to curse, utters a blessing; but he acquires a bad reputation, and becomes a by-word for idolatry and vice. Moab is also the scene of Israelite apostacy at Baal-Peor (Num. xxv); Midian, too, is involved, and in a holy war Midian is exterminated, and Balaam, responsible for the seduction of the people (xxxi, 16), is slain with five kings of Midian who, however, are elsewhere princes of the Amorite king Sihon (*v.* 8)! Indeed, according to a relatively old source, Sihon had seized Moabite territory from Heshbon to Arnon; and an old poem of the fall of Moab refers to some conquest, not (like that of Israel) from the south, but from the north (Num. xxi). At all events, Israel overcomes both Sihon and a more northerly Amorite chief, Og of Bashan, and thereby the Trans-Jordanic country is gained (Deut. ii *sq.*; in Judg. xi Ammon's complaint really refers to Moab). The land is allotted to Reuben and Gad—freely (Deut. iii, 12–21), or on condition that they help the other tribes (Num. xxxii *sqq.*); but their actual territories overlap both with each other and with Moab. It is evident that the data cannot refer to any single period, and that they represent different historical circumstances.

As regards Edom, an independent account of Esau's marriages and the Edomite subdivisions (Gen. xxxvi) unmistakably represents a very extensive and self-conscious unit stretching across south Palestine, with relations with the sub-divisions of Judah and Benjamin. The connection between Judah and the south was

particularly close at certain periods, and the south often exercised considerable influence in Judah—up to the day of the 'Idumaean' (*i.e.* Edomite) Herod. Now, according to some passages, the Israelites encountered the indigenous Horites, and giants like Og of Bashan (Deut. ii, 9 *sq.*), Anakim, and the cedar-high Amorites (Amos ii, 9), prehistoric and heroic worthies like the Rephaim, and the Nephilim, born of fallen angels and the daughters of men (Gen. vi, 4). We seem to have here the point of view of people from the desert. Caleb and the spies had seen the Nephilim (Num. xiii, 33), and he, 'the servant of Yahweh,' conquered Hebron and its 'sons of Anak,' while his nephew Othniel gained Kirjath-Sepher. Other conquests over 'Anakim' and kindred people will be mentioned later. But although Caleb's deeds are subordinated to the Israelite conquest (Josh. xv, 13–19, Judg. i, 10–20), we may recognize a once independent cycle, a distinct movement from the south into Judah, which will include not only Caleb (who was of Edomite affinity), but also his 'brother' Jerahmeel, who was partly of 'Egyptian' origin (1 Chron. ii, 34). Dan, too, may be associated with this tradition, and there are indications of the further movement of Calebites from the south of Judah to the vicinity of Jerusalem (1 Chron. ii) and of Dan from a seat south-west of Ephraim to the extreme north, near Phoenician territory (Judg. xvii *sq.*).

Both Dan and Naphtali are sons of Jacob's concubine Bilhah; and Naphtali, in turn, may be originally connected with cities near the southern Dan (Deut. xxxiii, 23). Simeon and Levi are associated with Shechem in central Palestine (Gen. xxxiv; cf. 2 Chron. xxxiv, 6); Kenites, the clan of Moses' father-in-law, are found in the north near Kadesh in Naphtali (Judg. iv, 11; contrast i, 16), and the lists of Asher contain some names of southern connection. The name Bilhah itself not only recalls the Edomite and Benjamite Bilhan, but is traditionally connected with Reuben who, once the 'first-born,' forfeited his tribal priority (see Gen. xxxv, 22; xlix, 3 *sq.*). Reubenite elements appear in the older account of the revolt of Korah (which, too, is an Edomite name); and, since a Reubenite name is even found in Palestine (Josh. xv, 6; xviii, 17), it would seem that at one time Reuben was a pretty extensive district. Whatever be the true explanation of the data, it is evident that there were tribal divisions earlier than and different from that which became familiar[1].

Besides the prominence given to the deeds of Reuben and Gad

[1] On this, see especially Burney's discussion, *Israel's Settlement in Canaan* (the Schweich Lectures for 1917). See further, below, p. 389 *sq.*

in Palestine on behalf of Israel (cf. Deut. xxxiii. 21), elsewhere clans of South Palestinian origin are connected with settlements in Gilead (1 Chron. ii, 21 *sq.*). When Jacob left Isaac (between Kadesh and Shur), he proceeded, according to one account, direct to the Aramaean Laban, in the north-east of Palestine (Gen. xxviii. *sq.*). These and other notices seem to point to definite traditions of a northward movement into Palestine and east Jordan on the part of clans or tribes who are not precisely the tribes of Israel. The current tribal scheme is in any case relatively late, and a close examination inevitably suggests that it has displaced earlier representations and arrangements. When Leah is the first, though not the favourite, wife of Jacob-Israel, some priority or greater antiquity is apparently attributed to the divisions incorporated under the names of Leah's children (Reuben, Simeon, Levi and Judah), as distinct from the Rachel tribes (Manasseh, Ephraim and Benjamin). Different claims were made, for, although Reuben was once recognized as the firstborn, Judah and Joseph contend for priority (1 Chron. v, 1 *sq.*). But it must be freely recognized that it is easier to discover conflicting representations than to find among the theories that have been proposed one that explains them satisfactorily. The importance of some specific body of southern tradition is, however, unmistakable, and it is further enhanced by what is known of the Levites, their distribution over Palestine, and their subsequent congregating around Jerusalem. The names of the Levitical divisions are closely connected with Moses and his family, and also with Judah and south Palestine, Edom included. Their entrance and distribution could readily account for some of the traditions of migration and movement; and it is noteworthy that among the biblical traditions are some which represent specifically south Palestinian and local standpoints, and that certain families of the scribes were akin to the clans who definitely claimed a south Palestinian or Edomite origin (1 Chron. ii, 55). In this way we could explain the *presence* in the O.T. of various traditions, although whether they are trustworthy is quite another question. Nor can we say that the historical events they reflect necessarily belong to the premonarchical age.

Although Israel was composed, to some extent at least, of Edomite elements, the 'father' of the tribes is also called an Aramaean (Deut. xxvi, 5). His wives, Leah and Rachel, are represented as Aramaeans, and their home was probably, not the distant Harran, the seat of the ancient moon-cult, but some nearer and more desert-like locality. How far south the term

Aram (which in the consonantal Hebrew text differs only by a 'tittle' from Edom) could extend is uncertain; it probably reached to the Edomite area, and some tribes could be regarded therefore as either Aramaean or Edomite[1]. The term is more especially associated with the northern region and Damascus. It covers Geshur and Maacah; but the latter also included (according to the true text of 2 Sam. xx, 18) the genuinely 'Israelite' cities of Abel and Dan. The Danite Laish lay in the Aramaean Beth-rehob (Judg. xviii, 28; 2 Sam. x, 6), and Machir, the 'father' of Gilead, is regarded as partly Aramaean (1 Chron. vii, 14; cf. ii, 23). The northern and eastern fringes of Israel were exposed to the inroad of Aramaean elements; and it is not improbable that there was some sweeping movement, an entrance of Aramaeans, who settled down and adopted the Hebrew language of the land.

The activity of the Habiru in the Amarna letters is thought by some scholars to reflect an Aramaean movement. And when the Moabites are called 'sons of Sheth' (Num. xxiv, 17, R.V. mg.), the reference may be to the Sutu bedouins who are mentioned with the Habiru (see pp. 299, 405, and vol. I, p. 234). The parallel between Jacob's entry and settlement and Joshua's invasions has already been noticed (p. 360). Though so much is uncertain, the stories of Jacob-Israel do seem to echo two fundamental traditions when they combine (*a*) Jacob's journey from the south of Palestine to the north and north-east, whether by way of Bethel or direct (Gen. xxviii, 10); and (*b*) his entry, with his Aramaean wives and family, after separating from Laban the Aramaean, Mizpah being evidently regarded as marking the boundary between Israelite and Aramaean soil. Hence there are two accounts of a theophany at Bethel, and of the change of the name from Jacob to Israel (Gen. xxviii, xxxii, 28, xxxv, 9; cf. Hos. xii, 4). Into further details it is impossible to enter here; but with such contrary traditions of the Edomite and of the Aramaean constitution of Israel the intricacy of the present narratives becomes readily intelligible.

III. THE ACCOUNT OF THE RISE OF THE MONARCHY

The account of the conquests of Joshua does not record the occupation of central Palestine. Joshua is associated with Timnath-heres (? Tibneh, north-west of Bethel), and Joseph's bones were conveyed from Egypt to Shechem; but the capture of this

[1] Similarly, centuries later, the line between Aramaean and Arab tribes east of the Jordan was very vague.

district, though implied, is nowhere described. Yet the account of the solemn assembly at Mt Ebal, and of Joshua's altar (Josh. viii, 30), when read in the light of the command of Moses (Deut. xxvii), should be the prelude to the work of occupation. Although Joshua's camp was at Gilgal near Jericho, there may have been some confusion with a Gilgal near Mt Ebal (Deut. xi, 30), and possibly, also, a tradition of some crossing of the Jordan opposite Shechem, analogous to the entry of the great ancestors Abraham and Jacob, and their journey to Shechem. Jacob, as we know, was also regarded as a conqueror of Shechem (Gen. xlviii, 22; p. 359); and central Palestine, it was perhaps thought, was already Israelite before the conquest. But if we do not hear how it was taken, we at least learn something of its expansion. The 'children of Joseph' (Manasseh and Ephraim), being in need of more territory, are enjoined to seize it (Josh. xvii, 14 *sqq.*); and the capture of Bethel, previously mentioned among the conquests of Joshua, is also ascribed to the 'house of Joseph' (Judg. i, 22). Both Ephraim and Benjamin were fierce fighters, and stories are told of the wrath of the former when they were not called up to aid Gideon (of Manasseh) in routing Midian, and Jephthah (of Gilead) in his defeat of Ammon (Judg. viii, xii). If, as seems probable, Machir was once west of the Jordan (v, 14), his conquests, though associated (like Caleb's) with the work of Moses (Num. xxxii, 40), may be part of a movement from the west, and this will explain the otherwise strange appearance of the tribe of Manasseh on both sides of the Jordan.

In striking contrast to the impression we gain of a great sweeping movement from Egypt into Palestine are the more individual and isolated movements, illustrated further in the stories of Dinah (some clan related to Dan?), Simeon and Levi (Gen. xxxiv), and Joseph, Judah and Simeon (Judg. i). The killing of Eglon by the Benjamite Ehud freed Ephraim from a Moabite occupation (Judg. iii), the defeat of Jabin of Hazor saved Zebulun and Naphtali (iv); and Gideon of Abiezer, Jephthah of Gilead, and Samson of Dan are primarily of somewhat local importance, though the exploits of these 'judges' are fitted into the history of a great and united Israel. In the ancient Song of Deborah (v) the Israel that is there threatened is disunited. There is, to be sure, an extraordinary story of the gathering of all Israel from Dan to Beer-sheba to blot out the iniquity of Benjamin (Judg. xix–xxi). But it falls outside the scheme of the 'judges' and certainly represents late ideas. Though unhistorical, its presence is noteworthy, and for three reasons: (*a*) Benjamin is

virtually wiped out, and is rebuilt by intermarriage with aliens of Jabesh in Gilead and of Shiloh. But, in the narratives that follow, Benjamin is the tribe of Saul, who has relations with Gilead, and the tribe is singularly important. Next, (*b*), the people are under Phinehas the grandson of *Aaron*; but in the preceding story of the origin of the sanctuary of Dan, after theft, rapine and murder, a Levite of Bethlehem, the grandson of *Moses*, is the priest of the place where Jeroboam set up a golden calf (Judg. xvii *sq.*). Finally, (*c*), Israel is a religious community and the ark is at Bethel; but, in the subsequent chapters, the ark is at Shiloh (cf. also Josh. xviii, 1) under the priestly family of Eli, which had been chosen in Egypt, but which, for the infamy of the sons of Eli (one of whom is named Phinehas), is threatened with extinction. The rise of a faithful and permanent priesthood is heralded, and we may recognize an allusion to the coming supremacy of the Jerusalem priest Zadok (later reckoned as an Aaronite) over Abiathar, who himself is said to be of the family of Eli (1 Sam. ii *sq.*, 1 Kings ii).

The biblical narratives as a whole fluctuate between the sweeping conquest by a united Israel of a thoroughly alien people and references to a more gradual settlement; the last is for good reasons —lest the wild beasts multiply (Ex. xxiii, 29; cf. 2 Kings xvii, 24 *sqq.*), and for training in war (see Judg. iii, 1–6). But, so far from maintaining their independence, the Israelites intermarried with the native population, who in fact continued to hold some of the most important cities. These cities commanded the chief routes, and virtually severed central Palestine from the tribes to the south and north. Saul attempted to exterminate the Gibeonites (2 Sam. xxi, 2), David took Jerusalem from the Jebusites (v), and Solomon completed the work of subjugation (1 Kings ix, 20 *sq.*), and to him is accordingly ascribed the building or fortification of some important sites. In the light of such evidence it is difficult to trace the history of the rise of the monarchy. Saul, with all his zeal and piety, made no effort to capture the city which Yahweh had chosen to set his name there, yet Saul was a godly and successful king, and his deeds really imply a united Israel as surely as do those ascribed to Joshua and Samuel.

Of the two conflicting accounts of the rise of the first king of Israel (p. 354), the later one, which regards the monarchy as an offence, follows upon Samuel's defeat of the Philistines, who, however, are also called Amorites (1 Sam. vii, 14); but, in the earlier, there is a picture of Philistine oppression and Israelite distress to which there is no clear prelude (ix). It has been lost, although

the introduction to the story of Jephthah the Gileadite, which describes the required situation in Palestine itself, has no obvious sequel (Judg. x, 6–16). This fact renders it impossible to recover any historical continuity, unless we may conjecture that, according to some old tradition, Saul immediately followed Jephthah. Saul, like Jephthah, saved Gilead from the Amonites; but, although he was raised up by Yahweh to deliver Israel from the Philistines, his son Jonathan becomes the hero of the story, and Saul is placed in a most unfavourable light. He is rejected by Yahweh almost before he has begun to reign (1 Sam. xiii *sq.*). Instead of the brave king, and the love between him and Jonathan, as set forth in the secular poem quoted from the Book of Jashar (2 Sam. i), we have a jealous and half-insane Benjamite opposed to the glorious ruddy hero, David of Bethlehem. It is David, the first king of Judah, who is the central figure of some of the finest specimens of Hebrew story, and upon him writers lavish their best. We read the history of the monarchy through Judaean spectacles. David wins his spurs by slaying a Philistine giant, who is identified with Goliath; but this worthy is elsewhere said to have been slain by Elhanan (1 Sam. xvii, 4, see p. 393). Much is told of David's valour and growing popularity, and of his unceasing friendship with Jonathan, who thus earns his father's enmity; and David's generosity to Saul's family is strongly impressed upon some of the narratives of David's reign as king—but not upon all.

David of Bethlehem is otherwise associated with south Judah, or with Philistine territory (Ziklag, Gath); his marriage alliances are with the south, and his policy is to win over south Judaean cities (1 Sam. xxx). Only at the death of Saul does he move up with his companions and become king over the 'house of Judah,' at Hebron, about 20 miles south of Jerusalem. Saul himself had been disastrously defeated in the north at Mt Gilboa by the Philistines; and the presence of this people, so far from the cities usually associated with them (Ekron, Gath, etc., p. 291), points to some sweeping attack upon Israel. Saul's body was exposed at Beth-shean; but the faithful men of Jabesh-Gilead secretly removed it, and the court was transferred across the Jordan. Saul's son Ish-baal—the form Ish-bosheth ('man of shame') is an artificial avoidance of the name of an abominated god—was made king at Mahanaim by Abner, his father's general, and reigned over Israel and Gilead. He recovered central Palestine from the Philistines, but by what means we are not told. David, who had already friendly relations with Moab (1 Sam. xxii, 3), tried, per-

haps successfully, to win over Gilead. Ammon, as Israel's foe, was also worth winning; and, as a matter of fact, David subsequently found good friends in Barzillai of Gilead and Nahash of Ammon[1]. The general situation is that of Judah *versus* (north) Israel, a Judah availing itself of Israelite difficulties.

In the fighting that ensued Ishbaal gradually grew weaker, and at last Abner plotted to seize the throne (2 Sam. iii, 6 *sqq.*). Brought to book, he went over to David, representing to Israel that David had been divinely appointed to deliver them from the Philistines. Ishbaal was slain by two officers of Beeroth, a non-Israelite city associated with Gibeon, Chephirah and Kirjath-jearim (Josh. ix, 17); and to the Gibeonites, who had not forgotten some attempt of Saul to extirpate the remnant of the Amorites, David handed over seven unoffending descendants of the king (2 Sam. xxi). He himself took Michal, Saul's daughter, from her husband, and, in accordance with oriental ideas, further strengthened his position over Israel by appropriating Saul's wives (iii, 13; xii, 8). The estate occupied by his son Absalom near Bethel (xiii, 23), and that given to Abiathar, his priest (1 Kings ii, 26), were doubtless not the only lands which David had seized (cf. 2 Sam. ix, 7). It is not surprising, therefore, that his kingdom should be loosely knit together, and that Judah and Israel remained rivals, with easily kindled passions. The men of the north claimed to be 'first-born rather than Judah' (so the true text in 2 Sam. xix, 43); and the stories of David's nephew and general, Joab, and the murder of Abner and of Amasa (iii, xx) are typical of the deep internal jealousies which repeatedly shook the Judaean and Israelite kingdoms in later centuries.

Some narratives present a picture of an inevitable and already existent rivalry—Israel *versus* Judah (cf. p. 355)—whether under Saul or David. The death of Saul would, of course, bring to the front the problem of the relations between the two sections. But as David moves up from the south to the capture of Jerusalem he fights 'Philistines,' and there are encounters at Gath, Bethlehem (where was a garrison), the valley of Rephaim, and elsewhere (2 Sam. v, xxi, xxiii). Further, we meet with giants, 'the sons of Raphah' (xxi, 16), and are back again at that primitive standpoint which knows of Caleb's defeat of 'sons of Anak' at Hebron, and of the overthrow of Anakim in the hill-country and the lowland (Josh. xi, 21 *sqq.*)—primitive worthies who, in fact, are also otherwise called Philistines (cf. Josh. xi, 22 with xiii, 3). David

[1] 2 Sam. ii, 5 *sqq.* x. In xvii, 27 'Shobi [the son of Nahash]' has probably arisen from a corruption of the needed verb 'brought.'

and his men are in alien country: such a tradition knows nothing of the relations between David of Bethlehem and Saul of Benjamin, or of Saul's rule over Judaeans, or of the settled conditions after Samuel's victory. Moreover, Jebusites hold Jerusalem, and from Araunah David must buy the site upon which was built the temple. Near his palace lived the Hittite captain Uriah, the husband of Bath-sheba, the heroine of David's sin, the first act in the vivid story of the revolt of Absalom, which relentlessly depicts the internal weakness of the Davidic kingdom, and the retribution for the blood-shed upon which it had been founded (2 Sam. xvi, 8).

Without going into further detail, it will now be seen that these varying accounts which culminate in the rise of the monarchy can hardly be resolved into a single, simple outline of events. Modern reconstructions of the early history of Israel invariably have to reject as 'unhistorical' all that which conflicts with what is regarded as 'historical.' The general outline of the biblical history really excludes the string of alien cities (Gibeon, Beeroth, Kirjath-jearim, Gezer and Jerusalem), which were so situated that, until David's capture of the Jebusite city, north and south were hardly one. Hence the not unnatural conjectures that David was the real creator of Judah as a political unit, and that Saul had no power south of Benjamin. The popular stories of Saul, Jonathan and David combine to present a picture which scarcely harmonizes either with the references to Saul's greatness or with the movements of David in an alien country. The powerful Saul, the first king of (north) Israel, and David, the founder of the Judaean dynasty, stand apart. On the other hand, those narratives which unite them, while discrediting the first king of the north, enlarge upon the friendship between the unfortunate Jonathan and the young David. They thus serve to unite Judah and Benjamin, and reconcile in some measure the jealous pride of Judah and (north) Israel in their respective heroes. Benjamin is a relatively late tribal name; its land, debatable land, lay between Judah and Ephraim (a 'son' of Joseph). In the Genesis story Joseph is very friendly disposed towards his young 'brother,' Benjamin, whose name ('son of the right-hand,' *i.e.* the south) points to dependence upon the powerful northern neighbour. But the land is also connected with the friendly Judah (cf. Gen. xxxvii, 22, 26 *sq.*), and includes Jerusalem (Josh. xviii, 16). Indeed, the term Ephrath, which is applied to Bethlehem, might even suggest an original southward extension of Ephraim; and, in this case, the union of Judah and Benjamin would be at Ephraim's expense.

Many generations after Saul's time there were valiant Benjamites who claimed him as their ancestor (1 Chron. viii, 40), and who would have an interest in their ancestral traditions, as naturally as had the families of scribes, whose associations are with the Kenites, and with the clans of Caleb and Jerahmeel, which had come from the Edomite south (1 Chron. ii). Hence, as we have already noticed the prominence of southern traditions, so we can now recognize efforts to give expression to Benjamite local tradition. We may even perceive signs of artificial adjustment. Thus, we may observe how, in the account of the defeat of Sisera by Barak and Deborah, both of whom belonged to the northern tribes, Deborah is artificially connected with a Benjamite locality between Ramah and Bethel (Judg. iv, 4). The other characteristic tendency appears when the record of the 'judges' of the Israelites is prefaced by a veritable 'philosophy of history' illustrated, not by some popular story, but by most meagre details of a great defeat of a northern Aramaean power by Caleb's brother Othniel, the son of Kenaz, a thoroughly Edomite name (ii *sq.*).

Thus, the criticism of the biblical narratives is, in the first instance, 'literary-historical' criticism, namely, that of narratives which, whether they do or do not represent the past in a trustworthy manner, invariably throw light upon the age to which they belong, the interests they represent, the classes for whom they were written and the districts in which they circulated. Hence we are obliged continually to look forward to the later vicissitudes which seem to explain the existing composite records, and we are unable to present any straightforward description of the history of Israel before and even during the rise of David. Further, if in the preceding pages no attention has been paid to 'literary' criticism, and the sources commonly known as Yahwist (or Jehovist), Elohist, Deuteronomic and Priestly, it is because there are data which often go behind the purely 'literary criticism'; and these must first be taken into consideration, whatever view one may adopt touching the literary sources. The writers of the Old Testament did not propose to present an objective history of the past; but in their attitude to the past, and in the traditions they use or reshape, they give expression to certain religious, political and other aims which are ultimately of real historical significance, though they do not illumine the period now under discussion. We recover much that is of extreme importance for a later period, nor are we without much that is pregnant for the earlier. See further, pp. 385 *sqq*.

IV. PALESTINE, PHOENICIA AND THE PHILISTINES

Before we resume the biblical history we must briefly notice the main facts that have first to be taken into account. The striking differences between our ideas of Syria and Palestine, based on external and contemporary evidence (chap. XIII), and the impressions conveyed by the O.T. become explicable when it is remembered that the biblical history, the earliest known piece of continuous history, is of composite origin and the last stage in a lengthy literary process. The country in which the patriarchs of Israel live and move—and for the most part in serenity—like the alien land into which the conquering tribes of Israel were led by Moses and by Joshua, was in reality one of ancient and thoroughly organized conditions. It had long been inhabited by Semites who, whether they should be styled Amorites or Canaanites, were very closely akin to those whom we call Hebrews or Israelites[1]. Indeed, in spite of a long succession of foreign (non-Semitic) influences, there is, on the whole, a certain continuous cultural history; and when allowance is made for Aegean, Philistine, Cypriote, Greek, Roman and Byzantine influence upon the pottery, there remains a certain interrelation or continuity: even the late 'Arab' (Mohammedan) ware bears a resemblance, which is often not a little remarkable, to the old painted pottery of ten or more centuries earlier. Similarly, notwithstanding the apparently deep-reaching influence of Greeks and Romans, old types of belief and custom have persisted, and the old names, carefully preserved among the people, have emerged as the exotic influences decayed, so that typical vicissitudes are exemplified in such sequences as Beth-shān, Scythopolis and the modern Beisān, or Accho ('Akkō), Ptolemais and 'Akkā. There has been uniformity, despite political and other changes; and although Egyptians, Hittites, Mitannians, Philistines, and other foreigners contributed effectively to the development of the land, their traces are not so clear as might have been anticipated; and the land succeeds in maintaining a certain autonomy and an individuality of its own (cf. vol. I, p. 192).

[1] Both 'Hittites' and 'Amorites' are terms which shifted somewhat in the course of time. The term 'Amorite' is applied quite generally in the O.T. to the earlier non-Israelite inhabitants, more specifically to those of the hill-country and of the mountains east of the Jordan. 'Canaanite' is used no less generally, or refers more specifically to the people of the coast-land. Certain biblical sources have a preference for the one or the other; but no entirely consistent usage can be recognized.

The widespread use of the Babylonian language and script among Semites, Hittites and others (pp. 332 *sqq.*), points to some earlier influence, which might naturally be associated with the history of the First Babylonian Dynasty and the empire of Hammurabi (*c.* 2100 B.C.; see vol. I, p. 493). But this period has also introduced us to a specific West Semitic or 'Amorite' culture, rather different from that of Babylonia itself; and consequently Amorites of Syria and Mesopotamia may have played a part similar to that of their successors, the Aramaeans, in spreading the *lingua franca* of the day (see vol. I, p. 230). In fact, the Amorites of the early Babylonian age correspond in some respects to the Aramaeans of the age of Assyria and Persia. But unfortunately there are many dark centuries, and we know too little of the cultural history of such important sites as Carchemish, Harran, Kadesh (on the Orontes), Hamath and Damascus, to speak with any confidence of the early conditions. The innumerable 'tells' of north Syria survive to indicate an early activity which was certainly not confined to those few ages upon which some light happens to be thrown. Recent studies on the old Semitic (? Assyrian, ? Amorite) colony in Cappadocia (p. 257 *sq.*) tend to show that here too may have been an important commercial centre of influence, like Damascus and Palmyra later. But how the familiar moon-god Sin appeared in 'Sinai'—where the name Horeb may also suggest the 'glowing heat' of the sun—and how such names as Jacob-el, Jacob-baal, Anath, Nebo, Dagan, Addu, and others, took root in Syria and Palestine, we do not at present know (vol. I, p. 233). The theory of some distinctive 'Amorite' culture and of its influence upon Syria and Palestine is attractive (cf. vol. I, p. 231), although Assyria is a political and civilizing factor not to be ignored.

When we descend to the fifteenth century B.C., Mitanni, the dominant state of the north, is carving out a great kingdom at the expense of Assyria; and, although we know little of what went before, later, at all events, Assyrian history is essentially one continuous effort to extend westwards and gain the coast-lands (pp. 239 *sqq.*). It is noteworthy that Adad-nirari of Nukhashshi has an Assyrian name (pp. 231, 310); and the characteristic combination of Shamash and Adad in the names of Assyrian kings of the period finds its counterpart in Syrian 'theology' of the Amarna age (p. 351). The old Assyrian royal name, Ishme-Dagan ('D. heard') may also be cited, in view of the occurrence of this divine name in Palestine (vol. I, p. 232), and apparently also in Cappadocia. When in course of time Mitannians and Hittites ceased to control the land we perceive sweeping ethnical changes

in the north, and towards the close of the thirteenth century minor Aramaean states ('houses,' *bitāti*) make their appearance in the north-west and south-west of Mesopotamia. From time to time Assyria struck westwards—and Babylonia, once under Nebuchadrezzar (twelfth century B.C., p. 247)—but a dark period follows. Subsequently (ninth century) powerful kingdoms are found in north Syria, with connections reaching into Asia Minor and Palestine; the name Hatti is also found along the littoral. Assyria must repeatedly dash herself against these heirs of old Mitannian and Hittite domination, until opposition was at length worn down, and the subjugation of the petty kingdoms in the south became only a matter of time—their fall being the end of the monarchies, first of Israel, then of Judah. But, between these two great periods of northern empire (Hittite-Mitannian and Assyrian) there was an age of relative freedom for Syria and Palestine, and it is in the light of larger developments such as these that we may seek to understand the rise of Israel and her neighbours.

In Egypt the reign of Ramses III marks the decline of Egyptian power. The day of great conquering Pharaohs was over, and the priesthood, against which Ikhnaton had struck a heavy blow, was gaining immense wealth and authority (p. 182 *sq.*). The Delta freed itself, and Wenamon's report shows how the decay of Egypt was contemporary with the growing strength of Dor and Byblus (p. 191 *sq.*). The coast-towns had always been accessible to strangers from the Levant, and the epoch-making movements by land and by sea in which the 'Philistines' and others were involved had led to new settlements and had inaugurated new traditions. They presumably mark the beginning of the iron age in Syria (p. 292). The Syrian ports became the heirs of the sea-trade of Aegeans and Egyptians; and, while we need not accept Zakar-baal's picturesque allusion to the 10,000 ships at Sidon, belonging to one Berket-el (the name means 'the blessing of God')—apparently a Phoenician merchant resident in the Delta—the rise of Phoenicia as an independent maritime power may no doubt be dated in the twelfth (? or thirteenth) century after the far-reaching disturbances in the Levant. It is significant that the Greeks took into their vocabulary, not Semitic nautical terms, but terms referring to trade and commerce (*e.g.* ἀρραβών, βύσσος, κάμηλος, etc.). The expansion of Phoenicia, in fact, may not be due to the inadequacy of territory (*e.g.* pressure exerted by new tribes in Palestine), but rather to the new circumstances attending the downfall of the earlier great Mediterranean powers (cf. p. 280). There had been Cretan colonies in Egypt, and, to judge from the pottery,

perhaps also in Palestine (see pp. 293, 427). It is Phoenicia which now begins to establish trading-centres, if not colonies; and tradition enumerates among the oldest, Utica, Citium, Gades (Cadiz) and Lixus (Mauretania); cf. pp. 557, 581, 590. Again, it is only late tradition which dates the foundation of Tyre (really a very ancient city) in the year before the fall of Troy (*c.* 1184, vol. I, pp. 178 *sq.*), and after the foundation of Sidon, the Sidonians having been driven out by the king of Askalon. In many respects, therefore, the period in question is that of sweeping movements which are a landmark in ancient history, and this interconnection between Askalon and the north agrees with what recurs from time to time—'Phoenicians' holding southern ports or with colonies in the south (*e.g.* at Mareshah), and 'Philistines' occupying the maritime plain and, therefore, the important route that runs along the coast to Phoenicia. On Askalon, see also below, p. 547.

Like the Phoenicians, the Philistines appear before us as, in many respects, a Semitic people. The question of their origin and culture has been dealt with elsewhere (chap. XII); and, although much remains obscure, both the O.T. and the external evidence agree in recognizing the prominence of the Philistines in the twelfth century and after. Moreover, the presence of Carian mercenaries, centuries later, in the time of the kings of Judah indicates, what is only to be expected, that there was constant intercourse between the Syrian coast and Asia Minor. In the eighth century we shall find independent 'Philistine' kinglets of some importance. Accordingly, the history of the Philistines in the O.T. may perhaps be regarded as properly that of the mixed people of the coastal plain of Philistia[1]. Indeed, the O.T. accounts of the Philistines frequently suggest a recollection of traditions referring to the later period. But the prominence of these people somewhere about 1150–1050 B.C. is a most valuable starting-point for the history of Israel, inasmuch as we may distinguish an Egypto-Hittite or pre-Philistine stage from that where the prominence and subsequent overthrow of these 'uncircumcised' aliens mark the rise of the Israelite monarchy.

Both Philistia and Phoenicia, then, may perhaps be preferably regarded as territorial names, the 'Phoenicians' being, strictly, the Semitic and other inhabitants of the sea-board from Mt Carmel to the Eleutherus, and, as such, always likely to be engaged in

[1] The name Philistia was subsequently extended (as was also that of Canaan), and was applied by the Greeks to the land as far as the Jordan and, later, even beyond. Cf. p. 295 and n. 1.

sea-trade. Hence, much of that which is regarded as 'Phoenician' is not necessarily 'Semitic.' The Jews of all ages have shown little predilection for the sea; and although some Israelite tribes (Asher, Dan, Zebulun) apparently adjoined the sea at some period, the kingdoms of both Judah and Israel were usually severed from the sea-ports by foreign territory. The Philistines are commonly associated with the five cities, Ekron, Gath, Ashdod, Askalon and Gaza. But at times they held sway over a larger area (including, *e.g.* Joppa); and the beautiful and rich plains of Sharon which, with Dor, lay between the Phoenician and Philistine cities would belong to the one or the other, save when Israel was able to control the coast. Dor (held by Solomon, 1 Kings iv, 11) was occupied by the Thekel (or Zakkal), allies of the Philistines (pp. 192, 285), and under king Badira, whose name may be Semitic (? Bad-el). The thoroughly un-Semitic place-name Ziklag, to the south of Palestine, may conceivably preserve some echo of the Zakkal (p. 291), and in the south we find the Cherethites whose name suggests the Cretans (p. 285). Lod (Lydda) itself may (as Hall thinks) be connected with the Cretan Lyttos. Our evidence is admittedly dubious, but at all events Philistines are also located at Gerar in the south of Palestine, perhaps near Gaza (Gen. xxvi, 1 compared with xx, 1, see also pp. 359, 392), and Gaza was the port for Crete and the Levant[1].

The importance of the Philistine area is self-evident. It united the maritime plain and its routes both with the old military road into Egypt and with the trade-routes from Gaza to Edom and Arabia. Gaza thus stood at the great cross-roads. It cannot be definitely stated that there was already in existence the old Arabian civilization of the Minaeans—whence a possible origin of the story of the founding of Gaza by (the Cretan) Minos (but see p. 288) —although relations between Babylonians and Egyptians—partly *via* this district—go back to a very early age (vol. 1, pp. 256, 262 *sq.*, 362). Certainly, in the time of the Israelite monarchy there seems to have been a south Arabian culture with which that of Israel had several points of contact, *e.g.* as regards ritual; and in view of the persisting relations, later, between Philistia and Edom, we may lay special emphasis upon the superior political importance

[1] It might be mentioned that not only has a connection been daringly found between the Hivites (Ḥivvi) and Girgashites of the O.T. and the Achaeans (p. 283) and Kalikisha (p. 281), but very sweeping theories of Levantine (Aegean, Greek, etc.) invasion and influence upon Palestinian ethnology are from time to time put forth, though upon rather precarious grounds. Some influence is of course to be expected (pp. 278, 303).

of the area at the southern end of Palestine between Gaza and the north of the Gulf of Akabah.

So long as the people of the maritime coast were independent, could exploit the fertility of the land, control the great trade-routes between Egypt and Damascus and between Arabia and the sea, and could both enjoy the fruits of commerce and hold the people of the interior, so long was an inland Israel subordinate to the Philistines and other aliens (cf. p. 291). 'When we stand on some eminence that commands this rich strip of territory, we find it easy to understand the bitterness with which through the centuries the Hebrews regarded the Philistines' (Macalister). With such a picture in our mind it becomes exceedingly significant that, according to early sources, two great belts of cities, connecting the maritime plain with the eastern routes, lay outside Israel's hands (*viz.* Megiddo, Taanach, etc., in the north; Gezer, Jerusalem, etc., in the south), and that when both Saul and David began to set up a monarchy all Israel was practically under alien domination (p. 371 *sq.*). The Amarna letters have already shown us how hostile control of the main routes would enfeeble the Palestinian chieftains who appeal to Egypt for aid; and it is noteworthy that even in Merneptah's inscription (p. 169), the Israel, who is distinguished from Askalon and Gezer (coast-land), Yenoam (? in the north) and Kharu (see p. 316), appears to represent a central Palestinian group of somewhat modest extent and authority. But the O.T. is our sole source.

V. ISRAEL, JUDAH AND KING SAUL

According to the O.T., the kingdom of Israel arose at some overthrow of Philistine supremacy; the more precise details of the prelude are doubtful. In the account of the anti-Egyptian disturbances in the Amarna letters, the *Sa.Gaz*, Habiru and Sutu are found scattered from Phoenicia and Syria southwards. Invading elements were doubtless involved, but those named are occasionally referred to as settled occupants of the land[1]. There is no philological objection to the identification of the word Habiru with the name of the Hebrews; and the latter, according to the biblical genealogies, represent a group considerably larger than the Israelites. The Amarna letters do not prove that the Hebrews were then invading the land—much less the Israelites; but they do point to movements on sea and on land and to critical internal conflicts in which the Habiru ('Hebrews') are

[1] Ideograms for country are used (1) *ki*, in CCXV, CCXCVIII (of the *Sa.Gaz*), and CCLXXXIX (the Habiru), and (2) *mātu* in CXXII and CCXCVII (the Sutu).

pre-eminently anti-Egyptian. Then, as later, there were conflicting policies, 'they call to Egypt, they go to Assyria' (Hosea vii, 11)—though now the Hittites are the northern alternative. The anti-Egyptian party permeated the whole country: it had its strength in the north, in Amor (Abd-Ashirta and Aziru); it found support in Hatti warriors, and in anti-Egyptian cliques in Mitanni; and it had won over some of the Egyptian officials themselves. On both sides the names are varyingly Semitic and non-Semitic; and while the Egyptian cause was bravely upheld in Jerusalem, Megiddo, Tyre and Byblus, and other cities, the opponents, as we have seen, gained a strong hold upon the main routes. Although this anti-Egyptian movement seems to be supported by some influential Semitic officials, it could hardly bring about the supremacy of any 'Hebrew' power: it is Hittite supremacy that colours the later history, and when both the Hittite and the Egyptian powers declined, there still remained the strength of their heirs, the minor northern states—*e.g.* Amor—and of the coast-land, before Israelites could be politically independent (see pp. 240, 318 *sq.*). The problem of the rise of Israel has yet to be solved.

When the Israelites entered Palestine we learn that they intermarried with the population, and adopted the native cults. The fact is of the utmost importance (Deut xxxii, 16 *sq.*; Judg. iii, 5–7; Ps. cvi, 34 *sqq.*). The older native traditions and those brought by the immigrants would naturally undergo some fusion. Moreover, this would recur at every entrance of important elements from the desert, when the traditions of earlier and of recent movements would react on each other. Notwithstanding the indebtedness of Israel to the priest of Midian (Ex. xviii; Num. x, 29–32), Midianites were also dangerous and destructive raiders, although the story in Num. xxxi shows how Israel could be recruited through Midianite blood (*v.* 19). Although Israel was in some part composed of Edomite elements, there were times when Edom was an implacable foe. Israelite writers have even preserved a perfectly independent Edomite list which has proved to be of the highest value (p. 366 *sq.*). Israelites also settled in Moab; but Moab, too, was sometimes hostile. Nor were the Philistines always detested (see p. 392): recent investigations suggest that fusion with the Israelites has left a permanent impression in the form of a certain 'European' or 'pseudo-Gentile' type which, according to Dr R. N. Salaman, still persists among the Jews. Hence, as the biblical history extends over a long period, and as from time to time tribes or groups were entering from the desert and settling down, the most conflicting standpoints and perspectives could easily

persist, and find a place in our composite sources. Besides the standpoint of the settled people, certain passages give us the characteristic attitude of the desert-dwellers, their dread of the great walled cities, their antipathy to the civilization of the towns. Again, with the innocent stories of the 'high places' (*e.g.* 1 Sam. ix) we can contrast the darker scenes which merited the condemnation of the reformers. We have at times the standpoint of men who are cut off from the cities; we learn how the Philistine overlords hear, at the rise of Saul, 'the Hebrews have revolted' (so read in 1 Sam. xiii, 3). Only as we realize how often 'the people' played a prominent part in the biblical history can we adequately appreciate the fact that the history was compiled and shaped for popular edification. The aim was to explain, justify and teach; and the lesson is characteristically implied in the narratives and not made explicit. History is retributive; the chain of cause and effect is in terms of divine action. Characteristic, also, of the biblical narrative is the deliberate avoidance of mythological and other speculation such as we find in the surrounding civilizations, although, to judge from many hints, it was familiar in Palestine. We note how frequently we are given the popular explanation of the meaning and origin of names (Penuel, 'the face of God,' Gen. xxxii, 21–32; see the whole passage), the origin of ceremonies and festivals, of social and religious customs, and so forth. Of particular importance is the association of various sacred places with the patriarchal and other figures of Israelite history, even as the local 'saints' of the sacred tombs of to-day are often the 'orthodox' heirs of earlier 'heathen' prototypes. We also learn something of the history of the Ark of the Covenant, the Tabernacle, the Temple, the Priesthood, and especially the rise of the lengthy dynasty of Judah, with all its profound significance for later Messianic ideas. The foundation of the Israelite people, the Exodus from Egypt and the Conquest of Palestine culminate in the Davidic king and in Solomon's temple of Jerusalem; the reader is thus led on to the kingship and the Jerusalem priesthood.

Our sources, which are highly composite and complicated, also appear to reveal the traces of particular monarchical and priestly tendencies, such as meet us in full force centuries later, when these narratives were receiving their present shape. Bearing in mind the ordinary characteristics of tradition and of the method of compiling history, we have to realize that the names are often older and more authentic than what is actually said of them. We have each tradition or narrative as it was at some particular age, and in some particular form. Thus, there may well have been a

sanctuary at Jerusalem in the time of Abdi-Khiba; but the writers find the inauguration of *their* famous temple in the days of David and Solomon. Hence it is often necessary to go beneath our sources and ask, What is the writer intending to represent? What does his standpoint imply? and—only after that—is his representation trustworthy? We have often the popular or traditional representation of what may be authentic data, could we but recover them. Some echo of influential Semites in the Egyptian service (*e.g.* Yankhamu, Dudu, see p. 323) may have lingered in memory. No doubt some conspicuous historic event occurred at the 'Red Sea' to justify the rise of the inveterate tradition which so inspired Israel (Ex. xiv *sq.*). We may even entertain the suggestion that the marvellous overthrow of the walls of Jericho is to be associated with some landslide to which we may perhaps find an allusion in the disturbance of the Jordan (Josh. iii, 16). But this method of interpretation, adopted in all sincerity in order to substantiate the biblical narrative as completely as possible, has most obvious dangers; and cautious criticism, it is not out of place to add, may consist in determining, not how little we need depart from the biblical history, but what interpretation of all the material affords the best means of tracing the course of events, and also provides a reasonable explanation of what cannot be accepted as trustworthy as it stands.

Archaeological discoveries, it is necessary to remember, have neither 'proved' nor 'disproved' the O.T. record, but have placed it in an altogether new light. Thus, as regards Genesis and other books of the Pentateuch, it cannot be maintained that the conditions as therein represented necessarily testify to the *early* knowledge in Palestine (say, before the monarchy) of the ancient Babylonian Code of Hammurabi. The Code may certainly have been known in the west; but, as it embodies old customary usage which existed both before it and independently of it, it does not follow that a custom or law which agrees with the Code is necessarily based upon it, or belongs to this early period. For example, when Abraham expelled the mocking Hagar at the demand of his wife Sarah (Gen. xvi, xxi), his act, although in accordance with the Code (Sect. CXLVI), does not prove that he knew the Code, or that the incident belonged to the age of Hammurabi (cf. vol. I, pp. 523 *sq.*). The Code long continued to be known, and more recent discoveries of Assyrian and Hittite collections, differing in some important respects from the Babylonian—the Assyrian, for example, being in certain details relatively less developed as regards legal and ethical ideas—prove that the

parallels in the O.T. need not be referred back either to the Code of Hammurabi or to its age. Many interesting points of similarity with ancient Babylonian usage can be found much later in the Talmud; and there are many elements of belief and custom which, taken by themselves, afford no indication whatever of the date to which they belong. Palestine possessed some degree of culture from a very early date; but relatively 'primitive' or 'archaic' usages always persisted among simpler communities, and these, coming to the front at certain periods of upheaval (notably in the sixth century B.C.), are not, as such, necessarily earlier than those which strike us as 'advanced.' In the account of Abraham's purchase of the Cave of Machpelah (Gen. xxiii) there is nothing to enforce its antiquity; but there is much that tends to make the record part of the latest (and post-exilic) sources of the book. Similarly as regards isolated historical statements, such are the general topographical and other conditions that the same sort of event could recur at several different ages; intercourse with and knowledge of Egypt, Assyria and Babylonia were not confined to any one age; and topographical and other considerations taken by themselves cannot prove the particular accuracy of a narrative which, on other grounds, is held either to be untrustworthy, or not to refer to the particular age which it purports to treat. A great deal of early history has been lost—*e.g.* the 'Amarna age' itself can scarcely be recognized—and we may contrast the historical completeness of the old story of Sinuhe (vol. I, p. 226) with the way in which the historical background has been 'washed out' of the narratives in Genesis.

It has already been stated that the account of Abraham's victory over Chedorlaomer and his allies (Gen. xiv) cannot be used for the history of his age (vol. I, p. 236). Even if Tidal, 'king of nations,' should prove to be the Hittite Dudkhalia (cf. p. 267), and the record refer to some event shortly before or after the Amarna age—in which case the date of Abraham must also be reduced—the internal difficulties of the chapter would still prevent our regarding it as a trustworthy historical source. What facts lie behind the perplexing reference to the supremacy of Cushan-rishathaim, king of Aram, over Israel, and his defeat by Caleb's brother Othniel, of Kenizzite or Edomite extraction (Judg. iii)? Some conflict between an Edomitic South Palestine and the Aramaeans of the north can be more easily conjectured than substantiated; and the king's remarkable name—as though 'Cushan (a Cushite?) of double-wickedness'—could suggest an echo of the Kassites of Babylonia, or of Tushratta of Mitanni:

and other conjectures have also been made. Shamgar, son of Anath, who, by his ox-goad delivered Israel from the Philistines (Judg. iii, 31; cf. the stories in xv, 15; 2 Sam. xxiii, 11 *sq.*), though among the saviours of Israel, has a foreign name which reminds us of that of Sangara, the Hittite king of Carchemish (eighth century, one of his allies was a Bur-Anati). But he is mentioned in the old poem, Judg. v, almost as a foreign oppressor, like the great Sisera himself. It is not unnatural that some king of north Syria might dispute a Philistine attempt to overcome Israel, and Israel's salvation would only mean a change of masters. Tradition has its own ways of preserving echoes of the past and of recording authentic history, and there is at least a certain appropriateness in the traditions of this unknown king of Aram, the obscure Shamgar, and finally the famous Sisera, whose name has Hittite connections. Possibly we have here the late echoes of a Hittite and early Philistine period.

'The Song of Deborah' (Judg. v), evidently the most ancient piece of Hebrew literature, is unfortunately very imperfect, and has probably been revised. It describes the disunion and oppressed state of the tribes of Israel, the absence of arms among the forty thousand of Israel (cf. the situation at the rise of Saul, 1 Sam. xiii), the unsettled conditions, the cessation of the caravans, and the difficulty of communications. Authority ceased; men had renounced their gods (? *v.* 7 *sq.*). The tribes were aroused by Deborah ('bee') and Barak ('lightning'); but there was no little apathy, and a city like Meroz is bitterly cursed for its treacherous failure to assist Israel in following up its victory. Such indifference and negligence are by no means rare (cf. Judg. viii, 5–9). The victory none the less was complete. The kings of Canaan under Sisera fought at Taanach, at the waters of Megiddo (the Kishon). Yahweh manifested his loyalty as a ruler over Israel (*v.* 11), and the stars in their heavenly courses (? stations) joined in the fight. The enemy was swept away in the storm, and Sisera, fleeing towards Kadesh in Naphtali, took refuge in the tent of a Kenite woman, who slew him as he was about to drink of the milk she offered him in response to his request (*v.* 26). It was an act of dubious morality which in the prose story becomes a downright breach of desert chivalry (iv, 19 *sq.*). A brief and vivid sketch of Sisera's mother with her princesses, eagerly awaiting the chieftain, concludes the poem; and, if it was composed by a woman (v. 7 is ambiguous in the original), we may notice the prominence of female characters in the book of Judges (cf. also Miriam's song, Ex. xv, 21).

The victory over Sisera and the Canaanites is ascribed to Barak (of north Palestine) and Deborah; and the flight of the army towards Harosheth of the Peoples (iv, 16) points to warfare in which Israel's enemy was probably the people of the coastland. (Judg. iv may also contain references to another battle.) The important cities Dor, Ibleam, Taanach, Megiddo and Beth-shean were not in the possession of Israel (Judg. i), and an enemy, thus holding the roads leading to the east of the Jordan, could prevent any effective alliance of those Israelite tribes which lay to the north and south. Hence, whatever Israel may have owed to the 'hornet' sent in advance to clear the way (Josh. xxiv, 12), the stimulus to this overthrow of Canaanites comes from Deborah, the 'bee'; and we are to suppose that the central and northern tribes were no longer separated. Judah, however, is not mentioned in the poem.

In the narrative that follows, an effort is made to establish a monarchy. Gideon, or Jerubbaal (perhaps originally two distinct heroes), was of Ophrah, which belonged to the clan of Abiezer of the tribe of Manasseh. The Midianites had overwhelmed the land as far south as Gaza; their head-quarters were in the famous valley of Jezreel, and Gideon, with the help of Manasseh and the northern tribes, cleansed the land. Ephraim, although participating, manifested a characteristic jealous independence. Called upon to be king of Israel, Gideon refused on the ground that Yahweh was king (Judg. viii, 23); it is the sentiment of the later version of the rise of Saul (1 Sam. viii, 7; x, 19; xii; see p. 354). According to the highly composite narrative, Gideon had begun as a courageous reformer, upholding Yahweh against Baal, the god of his father (note the sacred tree, Judg. vi, 11); and, when invited to reign over Israel, he sought to centralize religion and unify the people by setting up in his city a sacred object of cult. The writer, who views this as a snare and an offence, calls it an ephod, an object used for obtaining divine counsel; perhaps originally an actual image was set up.

But there were never lengthy dynasties in the north, and a story is introduced describing the sequel. It is connected with the ancient and famous city of Shechem, whose god was Baal-Berith, the god of covenants, and therefore an appropriate god for a city which lay near several important roads. At the sanctuary was a famous oak (cf. Gen. xxxiii, 20; xxxv, 4; Deut. xi, 30; Judg. ix, 6), and all the tribes of Israel here entered into a solemn covenant with Yahweh (Josh. xxiv). It was at Shechem, too, that Solomon's son Rehoboam must be crowned; and, when the mon-

archy was divided, Jeroboam made it the capital of the northern kingdom. Gideon had been regal enough to possess many wives and a large household; and on his death Abimelech, the son of a Shechemite concubine, gained the support of Shechem and the guardians of the sanctuary, and massacred all the princes. Jotham, the youngest, alone escaped, and in the well-known parable denounced the election of this low-born thorn-bush and proclaimed the fate of the choice cedars of Lebanon. In due course Abimelech was treacherously deserted, Gaal aroused the old Shechemite family of Hamor (for which see also Gen. xxxiv) and seized a number of cities, but was soon defeated. Abimelech, in turn, suffered a humiliating death at Thebez, about twelve miles north-east of Shechem. Thus was Jotham's curse fulfilled, although the author is too interested in the divine control of history to give us any further account of Shechem or of Jotham.

We now reach the period of the Philistine oppression (Judg. x). The introduction to the story of Jephthah, a Gileadite hero, refers to both Philistines and Ammonites; and his deliverance of Gilead—once more there is Ephraimite jealousy—thus associates him with Saul, who likewise was closely connected with Gilead. On the other hand, the stories of the Nazarite Samson, who 'began' to save Israel from the Philistines, are of a Danite hero of the clan of Manahath, of which his 'father' Manoah is the eponymous ancestor, and possibly, like Gideon, the reputed founder of a local cult (Judg. xiii should be compared with vi, 11–24). The stories of Samson ('solar') contain elements of solar-myth, and resemblances to the famous Babylonian myth of Gilgamesh. It is worth noticing that in the Amarna letters one Addu-dani (p. 314) is connected with the Danite district (*viz.* the cities Joppa, Gezer, Gath and Manahath). Dan may be an old name, and the story of the movement of Danite clans to north Palestine, to a district between Phoenicians and Aramaeans (Judg. xvii *sq.*; cf. above, p. 367), may perhaps belong to the same cycle as the later tradition of the movement which brought the 'Phoenicians' from the south (vol. I, p. 234 *sq.*).

The fame of Saul has been almost eclipsed by that of Samuel and David; yet ancient national tradition must have had much to say of the first founder of the monarchy. Indeed, the account of the birth and consecration of *Samuel* is that of the child who had been *asked* (*shā'ūl*); and this is precisely the meaning of Saul's name, and not of that of Samuel (I Sam. i, 20, 27 *sq.*). If Samuel had gained a sweeping and final victory over the Philistines—or 'Amorites' (vii, 14)—who had occupied the land, there is no

room for Yahweh's selection of Saul to deliver the people groaning under their heel (ix, xiii *sq.*); whereas if we regard the latter as the earlier and more authentic tradition, the prelude can hardly be found, unless we go back to the story of Jephthah. The Philistines had practically disarmed the Israelites (cf. the conditions in Judg. v, 8), and apparently had iron weapons (Goliath, 1 Sam. xvii, 7). Saul's victory over them is, like that of Samuel, accompanied with striking manifestations of nature (vii, 10; xiv, 15), and in this and other respects the first founder of the monarchy finds interesting parallels in the Ephraimite Joshua, the traditional conqueror of Palestine (Josh. x, 11). This parallelism is significant.

When Saul built his first altar—the place is not named—the 'rolling' suggests the site of Gilgal, which enters prominently into his traditions (1 Sam. xi, 14 *sq.*; xiii, 8; xiv, 33–5), and into that of Joshua (v, 9). To the 'troubling' in reference to the broken tabu, which gave rise to the name of Achor (Josh. vii, 25 *sq.*), there is a parallel in the 'troubling' of the people by Saul, also in connection with a tabu (1 Sam. xiv, 29). There is, moreover, a general agreement in the fights between Israel and the southern enemy. Both Joshua and Saul enter into relations with Gibeon; and while Saul in his zeal for Yahweh sought to exterminate this remnant of the 'Amorites' (2 Sam. xxi, 2), Joshua, in a narrative, which on independent grounds seems to be later, delivered them from the sanguinary zeal of Israel (Josh. ix, 18, 26). To the coalition of Gibeonite and other cities belonged Beeroth, the home of Saul's captains, who, after the death of the father, killed his lame young son Ishbaal (2 Sam. iv, 5). It is an indication of the feeling between Saul and these southern aliens: David, on the other hand, appeased Gibeon by handing over to their vengeance seven members of Saul's family (xxi).

In all these fights against the land south of Ephraim the district called after Benjamin naturally had first to be won. Near Gilgal Yahweh sent his 'captain of the host' to encourage Joshua (Josh. v, 13–15; the account is incomplete); and hard by Bethel was the place where, according to a late version, Jacob first received the significant name Israel: 'El (God) contends' (Gen. xxxv, 10). The site between Bethel and Ai had some specially sacred associations in Israel's wars (Josh. viii). It was also the scene of the separation of Abram and Lot (the father of Moab and Ammon), a duplicate of which is that of Jacob-Israel and Esau-Edom (see p. 360). Some profound difference between central Palestine and the south was evidently connected with this locality, and it is noteworthy that, not only was there a Reubenite name in the

district (see p. 367), but the tradition goes on to mention the incest of Reuben with Bilhah (Gen. xxxv, 22; incomplete) as an explanation of the degradation of that once important tribe and the consequent supremacy of Judah, and the narrative forthwith enumerates the tribes of Israel and the Edomite subdivisions. What tribal and national developments lie behind these data can only be conjectured; but it is at this point that we hear of the death of Rachel (the 'mother' of the Joseph tribes, Ephraim and Manasseh), and the birth of Benjamin. Not only does tradition thus represent some significant political difference as we proceed south, but Benjamin is the youngest of all the tribes, and his original name, Ben-Oni, is one of other Benjamite names which, together with those of Judah, link the southern clans with those of Edom (cf. p. 366 *sq.*). Hence it would seem that south of the 'Joseph' tribes was a great Edomite-Reubenite-Judaean *bloc*. Now, Rachel's grave is variously placed north of Jerusalem, near Bethel (Jer. xxxi, 15; 1 Sam. x, 2), or south of it, at Bethlehem (Gen. xxxv, 19; a gloss). The meaning of the difference is self-evident in that, according to the latter view, Jerusalem is included within the district associated with Rachel (cf. the name Ephrath at Bethlehem, p. 374), whereas, according to the former, Jerusalem would lie within the district associated with the population which was alien to the north.

The position of the debatable district of the tribe of Benjamin is ambiguous. Tradition perhaps regarded Saul as the creator of Benjamin—the late story in Judg. xix–xxi practically wipes out the old tribe and builds up a new one with the help of Shiloh (near Shechem) and Jabesh-Gilead. But the connection of the Benjamite district with Judah is close, and the indications of some essential difference between central Palestine (Ephraim) and its southern neighbours are too persistent to be ignored. Edom and Seir, on the other hand, are old terms, and even the Amarna letters seem to represent a political area stretching southwards, perhaps as far as Seir (p. 317). Similarly, much later, Gibeon, Gaza, Kadesh and Goshen form a single district (Josh. x, 41; p. 353). Accordingly, when the Song of Deborah ignores Judah, we may infer, not that there was no Judah, but that the district so-called lay outside the political horizon of the central and northern tribes. It is from these tribes that the oldest literary material, as a whole, appears to proceed, and the stories typically emphasize the extreme importance of the valley of Jezreel, the prominence of its towns (for Megiddo see already, p. 68), and its accessibility to travellers and raiders from the east (cf. Midian,

Judg. vi, 33), or west (Canaanites, Judg. v; Philistines, 1 Sam. xxviii).

Saul, after a reign of which later Judaean prejudice has preserved but little that is trustworthy, was overwhelmed by the Philistines at Mt Gilboa. The fact that the enemy appear so far north, and that Saul's body was taken to Beth-shean, suggests that, not the Philistine pentapolis alone, but the whole coast-land itself was united against this attempt of the tribes of the interior to form a monarchy. In so far as Saul had held the two great salients running out from the coast-land towards Jerusalem and Beth-shean (p. 381)—and the narratives represent free intercourse between southern and central Palestine—he had taken the necessary steps to weaken the Philistines and other peoples of the coast-land, and to secure the complete independence of Israel. The loss of the line running to Beth-shean split up Israel. Saul, like some other great kings of the north, left a weak successor, and his son is found ruling Israel from beyond the Jordan, with the help of his general Abner. That Abner should attempt to strike out for himself is intelligible (2 Sam. ii); and we may observe that in later times such famous kings as Omri and Jehu were originally military leaders. But he had to reckon with David, and when we turn to the traditions of David the difficulty of reconciling the various accounts of this age becomes insuperable.

To Saul, the founder of the Israelite monarchy, are ascribed victories over the Aramaeans of Zobah in the north (cf. p. 310), over Moab, and over the Philistines, Amalekites and Edomites of the south (1 Sam. xiv). Originally, he was probably not of Benjamin, but perhaps rather of Gilead. His opponents have dealt unkindly with his memory, but what was said of the famous ancestor Jacob is in some respects reminiscent of the great military leader Joshua, and Joshua in turn is reminiscent partly of this founder of the monarchy[1].

[1] Joshua's law-giving and covenant at Shechem (Josh. xxiv, 22 *sqq.*), famous for its covenant-god (Judg. ix), as also the ceremony on Mt Gerizim (so read in Joshua viii, 30; p. 370), the covenant in the land of Moab (Deut. xxix, 1) and the law-giving at Kadesh, the 'well of judgement' (Gen. xiv, 7; Ex. xv, 25), are all now subordinated to the Mosaic law-giving at Sinai-Horeb. As for Saul, as the first king of Israel he would have been no less a religious founder than Jeroboam (p. 363), but we are told only of his *first* altar (1 Sam. xiv, 35). The story implies that he was a religious zealot (*vv.* 36 *sqq.*; cf. also xxviii, 9).

VI. DAVID AND SOLOMON

David, too, does not seem, in the older traditions at least, to belong to Bethlehem of Judah. Indeed, several lines of evidence have suggested to some scholars that he was the creator of Judah, and his home has been sought in south Palestine. Few old traditions from Judah have been preserved, although the district had ostensibly been taken by Joshua and held by both Samuel and Saul. But while Israelite traditions knew of an alien southern neighbour that must be conquered, Judaean traditions express the characteristic tendency of the south to expand northwards. When David is associated with Ziklag, Hebron and Gath, and works northwards, we can distinguish (*a*) a vassal of the Philistine Achish of Gath whose steps are likely to be resented by a Saul who has interests in Judah (1 Sam. xxvii, 12); and (*b*) a movement against giants—'Philistines'—a strange population, viewed from the primitive standpoint of the desert-dweller (cf. pp. 367, 373 *sq.*). But David does not have to conquer 'Philistines' in the north. In the former case he is a figure whose behaviour in the south of Judah will alienate Israel, and there is a compact (north) Israel to be won. Here north and south are evidently already distinct units, which had been united under Saul, and were to be reunited under David, whose first capital is Hebron in south Judah.

The founder of the Judaean dynasty is a vassal of Achish, king of Gath (1 Sam. xxvii; for the name see p. 287). But the title of Ps. xxxiv calls the latter Abimelech, which is also the name of the 'Philistine' with whom Abraham made a covenant at Beer-sheba (Gen. xxi), while in a duplicate tradition it is Isaac who became powerful and entered into covenant-relations with Abimelech and the Philistines at Gerar (xxvi, see p. 359). If one tradition associates the rise of the Judaean dynasty with a friendly Philistia—and David had a body-guard of Cherethites and Pelethites (see p. 285)—certainly an unfriendly one was always a danger: the situation so far is thoroughly intelligible. When the first king of Judah is even associated with the wilderness of Paran in the south (1 Sam. xxv, 1; the Septuagint reads Maon, to conform with the narrative that follows), he finds an interesting parallel in the Edomite prince Hadad, who took refuge in Egypt, married the Pharaoh's sister-in-law, became a serious antagonist of Solomon, and is associated with Midian and Paran (1 Kings xi). David also reminds us of Jeroboam, who for his hostility to Solomon must flee into Egypt, and whom the Septuagint tradition confused with

Hadad. Throughout, the political importance of the far south of Palestine and its Egyptian connections is strikingly manifest; and many centuries later the rise of the Idumaean Antipater affords the crowning example of the way in which this region could reshape the history of Jerusalem.

Further light may be thrown upon the traditions of this age by an independent source (Gen. xxxvi), which reflects extensive Edomite interrelations east and west of south Palestine. In a list of kings who are said to have reigned before there was any king over Israel, the fourth is Hadad, who smote the Midianites in Moab. The event is sometimes conjecturally associated with Gideon's defeat of Midian: Edom and (north) Israel may, on this occasion, have been fighting a common enemy (cf. later, 2 Kings iii). The fact that the first king is Bela', son of Beor (? compare Bil'ām, *i.e.* Balaam, p. 366), is then held to be a chronological confirmation. The fifth and sixth kings, Samlah and Shaul, are unknown; while of the last two, Baal-hanan and Hadar (or rather Hadad), the latter is presumably Solomon's adversary, and Baal-hanan, might be no other than David himself (Sayce). We learn incidentally that the slayer of Goliath was Elhanan, the son of Dodo of Bethlehem (2 Sam. xxi, 19; xxiii, 24); and as Solomon was otherwise called Jedidiah (2 Sam. xii, 25), so David may have been known as El-hanan, or the equivalent Baal-hanan. If so, he may appear in the Edomite list as an Edomite who also became king of Judah, or as a Judaean or Israelite conqueror of Edom (2 Sam. viii, 14). In the latter case it is at least a coincidence that, of Baal-hanan's two predecessors, the second bears precisely the same name as Saul, to whom is actually ascribed the conquest of Edom (1 Sam. xiv, 47)[1]. The assumption of a Judaean-Edomite *bloc* extending to the southern border of Ephraim is strengthened by the traditions representing the 'Ephraimite' point of view noticed above, p. 390.

From the entirely conjectural identification of Baal-hanan, El-hanan and David (Sayce), we pass to the possibility (raised by Frazer) that 'David' was the name assumed by the heroic leader only after the capture of Jerusalem—was it, perhaps, the name of the city-god, with whom the new king identified himself?[2]

[1] The earlier, Samlah, is unknown, but forms of the name have south Palestinian and Judaean connections, and one is even associated with Bethlehem. But it might conceivably be an error for Samuel.

[2] See Sir J. G. Frazer, *Adonis*, 2nd edn. p. 15 n., 3rd edn. vol. 1, p. 19 n.; Sayce, *Modern Review*, Jan. 1884, pp. 155 *sqq.*, *Hibbert Lectures*, 1887, pp. 53 *sqq.*

The view is an extremely interesting one, and deserves attention, since the ancient conception of the divine kingship was known in early Palestine (see pp. 345 *sqq.*). At all events, David places on his head the crown of Milcom ('king'), the national god of Ammon. Hence, while Solomon honoured both that god and Chemosh of Moab (1 Kings xi, 7), to David, who already had close relations with Moab, is thus ascribed an act symbolizing some relationship, if not a virtual identification, with the god of the conquered land of Ammon (2 Sam. xii, 30)[1]. Solomon has important priestly functions, and David plays a prominent part in religious ceremonial, dances before the Ark, and blesses the people (2 Sam. vi); his sons even served as priests—though a later writer endeavoured to soften the statement (1 Chron. xviii, 17). As the 'light of Israel' (2 Sam. xxi, 17) he embodies the people's welfare (cf. the 'coal' in xiv, 7, and see 2 Kings viii, 19).

Moreover, the name David itself comes to have some significant uses. In the 'throne of David' and 'city of David' there is more than a reference to the historic founder of the monarchy of Judah. 'David' also connotes 'Davidic' (cf. Hos. iii, 5); it is a dynastic name, even as Isaac, Jacob and Joseph are tribal or territorial names (Amos iii, 13; v, 6; vii, 16). The ideas of the Davidic hope and of the Messiah, the 'Anointed,' point to a theory of sovereignty which reminds us of the Egyptian ideas of the divine origin and authority of the Pharaoh. Even to a late date the royal throne at Jerusalem was the throne of Yahweh, upon which sat his king (1 Chron. xxix, 23; 2 Chron. ix, 8). Further, it is at least a coincidence that in the inscription of Mesha, king of Moab (*c.* 850 B.C.), not only is there the first mention, outside the O.T., of the divine name Yahweh, but Mesha states that he carried off from Ataroth the *Arel* of *Daudoh* (true pronunciation of each is uncertain), an object which we may compare with the Ariel of David's Jerusalem in Is. xxix, 1 *sq.* This object, apparently the *genius* of the city, the heart of its religious-political existence, is the forerunner of the Tyché or Fortune. The name David itself (cf. also Dodo, Dodaviah, Dido, etc.) seems to mean 'loved one.' The word *dōd* is also used of a kinsman (father's brother), and there is much in favour of the view that, as the name of a god, it denotes the local tutelary deity, or protecting god, and that the prophet Amos actually refers to the oath by the *dōd* of Beer-sheba[2].

[1] See R.V. mg. Cf. the symbolical representation of the union of Upper and Lower Egypt, vol. 1, p. 266.

[2] In Amos viii, 14 for *d-r-k* (R.V. 'the way...') H. Winckler suggested

In the nature of the case we can hardly determine whether Dōd (or the like) was an old name of the god of Jerusalem, or was brought there by the first king. On the other hand, the sacred Ark, according to one tradition, had been borne by David's own priest, Abiathar, of the house of Eli (1 Kings ii, 26). His name (*Ebyāthār*) is closely related to that of Yether (Jethro), the father-in-law of Moses, and it is possible that there was some account of the journey of this sacred object into Judah from the south, entirely independent of the account of the fortunes of the Ark under Joshua—traces of this journey have already been pointed out (pp. 365, 367). There are, at least, conflicting statements of its history; and there is a distinct tendency both to ignore the debt to the kin of Moses (p. 362), and also to condemn the house of Eli, and proclaim a new and faithful priesthood, namely, that of Zadok (p. 371). Indeed, Solomon, it is said, degraded Abiathar and gave the first place to Zadok, who is essentially the representative of the Jerusalem priesthood. Late genealogical and other lists raise the Jerusalem priests and the Aaronites above those who are associated with Moses and the house of Eli. There was, however, some compromise and it seems probable that in the account of the fortunes of the priests of David and Solomon (Abiathar and Zadok), at the beginning of the monarchy, there is some reflection of later rivalries which were far more than merely ecclesiastical disputes. We tread upon difficult and obscure ground. The institution of the kingship was regarded in some circles as an offence; it was a slur upon the unique sovereignty of the God of Israel. It also affected the position of the priesthood. The Davidic hope, the Messianic idea itself, so far as it was one of human kingship, was not acceptable to all minds, and there is a striking difference between the regal and warring David, and the temple-patron Solomon, as 'peaceful' as his name itself implies (cf. especially 1 Chron. xxii, 9)[1].

With Solomon begins the history of the Temple and the supremacy of the Jerusalem priest Zadok. The Book of Kings,

d-d-k (*dōdĕkā*, thy *dōd*); the Greek version itself renders 'thy god.' It may be added, as thoroughly typical of the complexity of our problems, that David's blond beauty (1 Sam. xvi, 12) has been explained (1) as suggestive of kinship with Philistines or Greeks (see p. 382, foot), or (2) as a Tammuz-*motif*.

[1] The relation between the Davidic and Messianic ideas, on the one side, and the Solomonic ideas ('wisdom,' and erotic mysticism), on the other, does not of course come under consideration at this early period.

as a whole, takes us away from the foundation of temporal power to the history of the Temple of Jerusalem. David's wars, we are to understand, had prevented him from building the Temple, his hands were stained with blood (1 Kings v, 3; 1 Chron. xxii, 8; xxviii, 3); it is perhaps for this reason that the account of the purchase of ground from Araunah is placed where it is (2 Sam. xxiv), apparently at the close of his reign. On the other hand, we learn that Yahweh does not need a house, it is David's 'house' (dynasty) that will be built (2 Sam. vii); only by way of compromise do late writers in 1 Chronicles enlarge upon David's very elaborate preparations for the Temple. Solomon, we are further told, built or fortified such important cities as Megiddo and Beth-horon. His Egyptian father-in-law cleared Gezer of Canaanites, and gave the city to his daughter; only in this reign was the land cleansed of the earlier non-Israelite inhabitants. Egypt, it would appear, still laid claim to the southern coast-land, and Solomon's powerful alliance would keep Philistia quiescent. Solomon also made a covenant with Tyre, and with Tyrian help built the Temple. The Tyrian artificer, Hiram, whom he employed, was of the tribe of Dan; and it is noteworthy that Oholiab, whom tradition made a famous craftsman in the Tabernacle in the Wilderness, was also a Danite (Ex. xxxi, 6; 2 Chron. ii, 14), whose very distinctive name has parallels in both old Arabian and Phoenician inscriptions. The tradition of an important movement of Danites from South Palestine as far as Phoenicia, seems to have been a persistent one (see pp. 314, 388); and Danites, if we may rely upon Judg. v, 17, may even have taken part in Phoenician trading-journeys. Later in the history we find a determined effort to spread Tyrian religion in Palestine (ninth century, Ahab and Jezebel), and, according to Amos (eighth century) there had been 'brotherhood' between Israel and Tyre, until Tyre was guilty of unforgivable treachery (Amos i, 9).

Relations with Tyre go back to an early date, and it is a striking fact that in the Amarna letters Abimilki of Tyre calls his city the 'city of Shalmiati.' This recalls the names of Solomon (Heb. *Shĕlōmōh*) and Jerusalem (Uru-salim in Amarna letters). The latter presumably means 'foundation of Shalem'; and since a god Shalman (associated with Resheph) is known, it has been thought on various grounds that the city bears the name of an ancient deity, probably a Sun-god. Abimilki refers to Tyre either as the city of the Egyptian Pharaoh—his divine suzerain (cf. p. 341)—or as that of Shalmiati; and as the latter name is not treated by the scribe as that of a deity, we seem to have a personal link

as in the name of the 'city of David.' The name of Solomon himself seems to connect him with the city whose Temple he built, whereas his alternative name Jedidiah (2 Sam. xii, 25, the 'beloved of Yahweh') associates him with David ('beloved'). The true interpretation of such details as these is uncertain, but it will be noticed that the accounts of Solomon, the Egyptian and Phoenician alliances, the consolidation of the kingdom and the inauguration of the Temple and priesthood—not to mention the famous story of the visit of the Queen of Sheba—combine to present a picture very different from that of the warrior David, whose chief sanctuary was presumably at Gibeon, half-a-dozen miles north-west of Jerusalem (1 Kings iii, 4). Indeed, the history of Saul, David and Solomon holds so commanding a place in the scheme of biblical history, and the different records so seem to link together the centuries in which these great figures are placed, that it requires an effort to recognize that the old historians, while conscious of the significance of the age, had at their command only incomplete material and incompatible traditions.

VII. SOME CONTEMPORARY IDEAS

The names of David and Solomon are significant. That of Zadok himself, too, throws light upon early ideas. Although Zadok (*Ṣādōḳ*, 'righteous') is placed at the head of the temple-priesthood in the time of Solomon, his name has older associations. Adoni-zedek ('the lord is righteous'), king of Jerusalem, was conquered by Joshua (x, 1) and Jeho-zadak ('Yahweh is r.') was high-priest in the sixth century. Tradition also spoke of Abraham's contemporary, Melchizedek ('the [or my] king is r.') of Shalem, priest of God Most High (Ēl 'Elyōn, Gen. xiv, 18). This divine title itself is ancient: the 'supreme god' of Hammurabi was Anu, the god of heaven—the feminine Anath is well-known (p. 347); and long afterwards the Phoenicians still knew of an 'Elyon called Most High.' The mysterious figure of the priest-king appears to be that of 'a traditional figure of great antiquity on whom the monarchy and hierarchy of Jerusalem based their dynastic and priestly rights' (Skinner). The author of Hebrews vii, 1 *sqq.*, speaks of him as an eternal priest, like unto the Son of God. We may doubtless recognize the conception of a type of which the priest-king (later the high-priest) was supposed to be an incarnation. We may compare the 'Davidic' idea above (p. 394), but should note that Zadok belongs to Solomon rather

than to David. The evidence, in spite of its lateness, agrees with ancient thought. It may be no mere chance, therefore, that, according to Isaiah (i, 26, eighth century), Jerusalem, the purged city, was to be as in olden time the 'city of righteousness,' and that Jerusalem is also styled by Jeremiah a 'homestead of righteousness' (Jer. xxxi, 23; l, 7).

The persistent association of 'righteousness' with Jerusalem is of the greatest interest. A derivative of the root occurs in the Amarna letters once (CCLXXXVII, 32), when Abdi-Khiba of Jerusalem protests that he is 'in the right' (p. 343). It is used in the O.T. of just weights, of legal and social rights and duties, of social obligations, of conformity to truth and right[1]. Thus, Yahweh is true to his character, or to his covenant with man; and, as in the old 'Song of Deborah,' manifests his 'righteous acts' by delivering his people from the foe. As applied to both gods and men it is capable of profound ethical and spiritual development. The word has certainly a common legal meaning; but right is judged by customary usage, and, conversely, the word for judgment (*mishpāṭ*) is used of a rightful due, custom or customary act.

The fundamental meaning seems to be what is due or just, what should be; and men have certain convictions, not only of the proper behaviour among men, and of men towards the gods, but even of the gods towards men. The root is used in Arabic of what is congruent, of what conforms to its proper nature, and also of logical truth. Derivatives denote the next-of-kin (Nabataean), relatives (Syriac), and a special female friend, and a gift for her favours (Arabic). The underlying idea, on the whole, appears to be that of what is due and right *among the kin-group*—the group, not only of men, but of men *and* gods, for in old Semitic thought, as Robertson Smith was the first to elucidate, gods and men formed a single natural community. Our words 'kin' and 'kind' are suggestive, provided it be remembered that the old Hebrew term, which we render 'righteous' ('just,' 'due,' and the like), had a very much wider and far less specialized application. A late Phoenician myth mentions the two gods Misōr ('uprightness') and Suduk, and ascribes to them the discovery of the use of sâlt—very appropriately, inasmuch as bonds of friendship and piety were created by the use of salt in meals (note the 'covenant of salt,' Num. xviii, 19). Apart from the question whether there was also a god Ṣedek at Jerusalem, then, it may be concluded that

[1] In Is. xlv, 8, *ṣédeḳ* and *ṣedāḳah* refer respectively to universal order (of heavenly origin) and social righteousness (displayed by man).

this persistent association of the idea of 'right' with the city carried with it ideas, beliefs and practices which were capable of profound development.

It is, further, a fact of no less significance that in the time of the Egyptian king Ikhnaton, special emphasis was laid upon ideas of truth, right, righteousness and justice (p. 120). One word is used, the precise *nuance* of which—like that of the Hebrew 'right'—depended throughout upon the particular context. Maat, the goddess of truth, was the impersonation of fixed law, divine and moral; she was wife of Thoth, the creator of civilization, and daughter of Re, the sun-god. Ikhnaton called his new city the 'city of truth' (cf. the name of Jerusalem in Isaiah i, above); and the Sun-god, everywhere a god of justice and righteousness, is the centre of his monistic and universalizing religion (p. 205 *sq.*). It is probable that he built a temple to his god Aton in Syria; and some authorities point to Khinnatun, on the border of Zebulun, near Accho, and situated upon an important trade-route (see p. 313), and interpret the name to mean 'glory of the Sun-disk (Aton).' However this may be, there were close relations between Egypt and Jerusalem, and Abdi-Khiba emphasizes his own claims, he was the king's shepherd, and his *ú-i-ú* (see p. 321, n. 1), and the claims of the city—the king had set his name upon it. To judge from letters from Byblus, Tyre and elsewhere, other writers could perhaps have made similar claims. No doubt all Palestine and Syria would know something, at least, of Ikhnaton's religion. His ideas would not, in any case, have been quite strange to Syria, accustomed as it already was to Sun-gods and divine kings. The fine symbol of the Sun-disk with its rays terminating each in a hand (p. 111 *sq.*) conveyed an idea that would be perfectly intelligible, and would give reality to familiar metaphors of the divine hand, whether upon man, or extended for man's help. Various features in Ikhnaton's conception of the universal and comprehensive beneficence of the Sun would be new, but the filial relation between king and gods would be no novelty. When Ikhnaton worshipped, as his father, not the visible material sun, but the sun as a life-giving power, Aton was regarded, like a Baal, as producer, cause, functionary or genius. But there was the same easy possibility of confusion between the effective power and its visible manifestation that there was between a god and its embodiment, as, for example, between the El and the Beth-el (cf. Gen. xxviii, 22).

In Egypt, both the Hyksos and an obscure Syrian upstart (p. 171 *sq.*) were iconoclastic, and Ikhnaton's reform itself has also

sometimes been ascribed to Asiatic influence. At all events, the royal house of Mitanni was related by marriage to the Egyptian dynasty; and, to judge from the name of Abdi-Khiba ('servant of the goddess Khiba'), Mitannian influence also reached Jerusalem (p. 332). Among the Mitannians are found names compounded with *Arta*, which appears to be a post-Aryan or pre-Iranian form of the later Persian Asha (cf. the later name Artaxerxes), and corresponds to the old Indian *Rita* (cf. p. 331). *Rita* is 'order' in its most general or undifferentiated sense: moral, social and ritual; moral rule, cosmic law, and the 'nature' of things. *Rita* made things what they were—true to type. In the old Aryan religion it was under the guardianship of Varuna, a god of markedly ethical character, who was lord of gods, the upholder of the moral law and the source of *rita*. Varuna finds a later parallel in the ethical Ahura-Mazda of Zoroastrianism, whose influence upon Palestine will be considered in its proper place. But besides the presence of the Arta-names, the astonishing fact, which we owe to the Boghaz Keui tablets, is the occurrence, in the Mitanni version of the treaty between Mattiuaza and Shubbiluliuma of Hatti (p. 262), among the various gods (including those of the *Sa.Gaz*), of 'the gods Mitrassil,' 'the gods Arunassil' (or Ur[u]vanassil), 'the god Indara,' and 'the gods Nashatianna[1].' Here are to be recognized Mitra, Varuna, Indra and the Twins (Nāsatya, the husbands of the daughter of the Sun). All of them were gods evidently prominent and relevant enough to be included amongst those who witness and safeguard the treaty. Indeed, Mitra (the later Mithra) was 'friend' and personification of friendship and guardian of treaties, a moral god and closely associated with Varuna, who also watched over oaths, ordeals and treaty obligations. Both were guardians of royalty and of law.

In this far-reaching prominence of ideas of order, right and law —with which may be compared the Greek Dike and Themis— there is nothing wholly new. Long before, Hammurabi had received his Code from the Sun-god Shamash, and Shamash was the 'father' of Right (*Kittu*) and Uprightness (*Mēsharu*). Wherever gods and men were thought of as closely interrelated members of a community, tribe or state, there were necessarily ideas of what was right and just, though no doubt they were still rudimentary. But behind the essential points of resemblance among the old

[1] Cf. above, vol. I, pp. 237, 312; and for the plural 'gods'—like the Hebrew Elohim (a plural of majesty, amplification and intensification), see pp. 341 n, 350. If Abdi-Khiba's name may be read Arta-Khiba (see Burney, *Judges*, p. lxxxvi n.), it would correspond to the Hebrew name Zedek-iah.

religions, there are characteristic, and no less essential, differences which, it is very important to notice, can already be recognized. Although the Indian god Varuna in his ethical aspects more closely resembles the Israelite Yahweh than does any other contemporary god, Hebrew thought, in developing the moral and spiritual aspects of the relation between man and his god, takes a line characteristically different from the later separation of Varuna and the impersonal *rita*. In India Varuna came to be subordinated to the national god, Indra, a warrior and a storm-god of the Teshub-Addu-Baal type (see p. 348 *sq.*). This type was familiar in Palestine, and, accordingly, we find later that, while in India Varuna suffers a decline, the prophets of Israel contend for Yahweh against Baal, and uphold the moral character of Yahweh against ideas associated both with the Addu-type and with neighbouring religions. This characterizes the history of Israel. Moreover, while the impersonal *rita*, as a quasi-physical or rational principle, differs markedly from the later ethical Persian Asha, the ideal and genius of justice and equity, there is a certain sympathy between Semitic and Persian ethical tendencies, which, although especially significant in the Persian age, may well go back to the age of Hatti and Mitannian predominance[1].

Love of order, the idea of a rational universe, and aversion from an emotional mysticism characterize the Greek rather than the Semite (cf. p. 604 *sq.*). When *rita* was removed from the guardianship of Varuna the idea of order could develop apart from religious ideas; the way lay open for the beginnings, notably in western Asia Minor itself, of 'natural science' (cf. p. 550 *sq.*). Similarly, Ikhnaton's love of truth and nature, most conspicuous in the Amarna art (pp. 121, 411), his recognition of a single cosmic principle, and the absence of any emphasis upon purely ethical or spiritual values, might perhaps have led in the same direction. But in Egypt there was no further development, and in Asia Minor we have a period of disintegration. Only in Palestine do we find any real progressive movement. The Semitic mind, however, had no clear conception of order or of nature.

[1] At the present stage of knowledge it is possible only to observe that it is uncertain whether the god Varuna—the forerunner of Ahura-Mazda—is really Indo-European, and that the wave of ethical reform (cf. p. 403, n. 1) which introduced him and put him at the beginning of the history of Indo-Iranian religion lies outside history. It is of interest to notice that an appreciation of personality and a sense of truth have been remarked in the Hatti texts as a whole. For the present, Hatti and Mitanni seem to hold all the keys.

Things are in the care of God, or of powers, departmental or functional, local or national; and although the powers are thought of as personal, ideas of personality are fluid and unstable. The world could not be severed from the gods or God, and the gods are apt to be somewhat arbitrary. But, as we have seen, the world was not left to these powers alone; there are special individuals distinguished by their office, or their sanctity, or for other reasons, and these can directly or indirectly influence the natural and supernatural realms (cf. vol. I, p. 211). Hence we can understand, not only the early pre-eminence of divine-kings, or priests, or prophets, or other sacred individuals, but also their ability to mould current ideas of right and wrong, and of good and evil. The ambiguous Egyptian term *ḥīke*, which is variously 'religion' or 'magic'—according to our modern estimate of the true meaning of every reference—is thoroughly typical of the undeveloped character of early ideas (pp. 199, 202). The 'holy' men, like the 'holy' goddess Kadesh herself, were not necessarily of elevated moral character—they might be quite the contrary (see vol. I, pp. 199, 209, 354 *sq.*). The ideas of what was 'right' and 'just' varied with the particular standpoint of the tribe, people or reformer. They represented the thought of the time: the 'laws of uprightness,' which Hammurabi vaunts, afford an excellent illustration (see vol. I, pp. 516 *sqq.*). Personality, rather than principle, is the chief factor in Semitic history (cf. vol. I, pp. 195, 212); and a Moses fittingly stands at the head of the religious history of Israel.

If the name Jerusalem suggests the idea of wholeness and peace (Heb. *shālōm*), the root also denotes recompense or requital; and, whether or not there was a god Shalem, god of reward or retribution—and the prominence of the idea of 'righteousness' suggests that there was—the 'Psalms of Vengeance' alone serve to indicate what, even at a more advanced age, men could expect from their own deities (cf. Ps. lviii, 10). If, too, David's name is that of a 'loving' protecting deity, especially associated with Jerusalem, there is a sexual use of the root (cf. *dūdā'īm*), and the O.T. testifies to the persistent licentious cults in connection with the local Baals, the causes of the increase of life and growth (also at Jerusalem, see I Kings xv, 12 *sq.*; 2 Kings xxiii, 7). If the Egyptian king killed captives that his name might 'live for ever,' the sacrificial ideas of the Semite involved the conviction that supernatural powers must be sustained or nourished, and human sacrifice was all too common among the western Semites. Later, we shall find in and around Jerusalem itself signs of gloomy cults, doubtless of ancient origin. The early prominence of goddesses

of the Astarte type testifies to the prevalence of some of the more unrestrained sides of the early religion, and the utterances of the prophets themselves warn us that in olden times there were religious injunctions that were not good, and that men ascribed to Yahweh demands that had never entered his head (Ez. xx, 25; Jer. vii, 31; xix, 5).

In a word, we must not be misled by the early occurrence of concepts or ideas ('sacred, righteous,' etc.) to which we commonly tend to attach only some distinctively ethical or spiritual significance. Nor must we belittle the stage of religious development in Palestine. While, on the one hand, the biblical narratives do not permit us with any confidence to describe either the religion of Moses—although we can recognize some outstanding religious genius—or the conquest of Palestine by the Israelites—although some important movements can certainly be perceived—on the other hand, the study of the general conditions in Palestine itself is the more practicable enquiry[1]. In Palestine religion was barbaric but capable of development; there were possibilities of ethical advance, and of deterioration, and the need of some new religious revival. The 'Amarna' age was international (cf. the Greek 'heroic' age, p. 485), and there were tendencies towards the recognition of supreme gods. Later, also, we find Tukulti-Ninurta and other Assyrian kings calling themselves 'Sun of all peoples,' an indication of monarchical monotheism. Ikhnaton himself is a land-mark in ancient history. As king-priest and son of the universal Sun-god, Aton, he withstood the Theban priesthood; he is an early example of a priestly king in antagonism to the hierarchy. The priesthood won the day; but in the gradual weakening of national religion personal religion became deeper (p. 160 *sq.*). The close interrelations between Egypt and Syria under the earlier Ramessids may allow the surmise that Syria did not remain untouched by Ikhnaton's democratic symbolism and subsequent religious vicissitudes of Egypt. Baal, it is true, became more prominent in Egypt, and the god has a distinctly warlike and harsh character (p. 349). But we are ignorant of the internal social-political conditions in Palestine, and these would certainly shape the fundamental ideas which we have been considering.

The general tenor of the O.T. itself suggests that Israel intro-

[1] It will be noticed how, on general grounds, it is tempting to associate Moses and the Exodus with such profoundly interesting and vital periods as (*a*) that of Ikhnaton's reform and the 'Amarna' age, or (*b*) the far-reaching movements, later, towards the close of the thirteenth century B.C. See p. 356, n. 2.

duced into Palestine, not a new god, Yahweh, but a new stage in the history of his development (cf. *e.g.* Ex. vi, 3). Just as, in the ninth century B.C., the prophet Elijah, in his fight against the Phoenician Baal, went down to Horeb for a new revelation of Yahweh (I Kings xviii), so now, some new religious development is persistently connected with Horeb, but not with it nor with Sinai alone. Solemn law-givings and covenants are also associated with Kadesh, the plains of Moab, and Shechem—though what new ethical or other advance was due to Israel can hardly be gleaned from a criticism of the O.T. In any case, the tendencies in the Amarna age towards a supreme god in Palestine do not point to Yahweh, although the name Akhi-yawi may prove that he was known (p. 349). The far-reaching disturbances which shook the Levant in and about 1200 B.C. must have reacted upon Palestinian religion, but we can hardly conjecture their consequences. In fact, we do not know how Yahweh became the national god of the land. The evidence of personal names associates him slightly with the family of Moses, and with the age of David. But it is remarkable that we do not hear of an Edomite national god, like the Moabite Chemosh, or the Milcom of Ammon, nor is there any condemnation of the religion of Edom. If Yahweh had been worshipped by the two 'brother' peoples, Esau (Edom) and Jacob (Israel), it is possible that a purer cult always prevailed among the desert people outside the more civilized cities of Palestine itself (cf. vol. I, pp. 194, 210 *sqq.*). On the other hand, the name of the god Hadad is especially associated with both Edom and Syria (above, pp. 349, 393), and in view of the prominence of Addu, or Hadad, in the Amarna period, we have to explain, in the first instance, how Hadad was ever replaced by Yahweh.

These two gods are closely related, and it is possible that the name Hadad, once familiar over the whole land, from north Syria to Edom, was suppressed by tribes united by the worship of Yahweh. The account of the Israelite conquest represents a mighty invasion, but certainly—on both internal and external grounds—*not* the actual event we have to postulate. The history of the age has been lost, though tradition has no doubt preserved some echoes of it.

The religion of the monarchical period so resembles that of the earlier age that Yahweh could not have been an entirely new type of god: we may compare the relation between Aton and the old Egyptian god Amon-Re, the former being an old name, though with a new meaning. We may further suppose that some great movement spread the name southwards into Edom, if not, indeed, to the Sinaitic peninsula and Midian; and that when in time the

original Yahweh-religion had deteriorated in Palestine itself, a new spirit animated it from the southern desert. On independent grounds it may be conjectured that the origin of the worship of Yahweh is to be associated with the Aramaean Sutu tribes of the north, and with this would agree the persistent tradition of the Aramaean origin of Israel and possibly the old prominence of the name of Seth (see p. 368 *sq.*, and vol. I, p. 234 *sq.*).

Such conjectures would explain some of the main facts, though not all. The oldest recognizable biblical traditions are fragmentary, because they have been subordinated to much later views of the past. New-comers from the desert would constantly settle down and lose their earlier simplicity of thought; the ascent in social conditions regularly meant a religious descent (cf. Deut. xxxii). But O.T. history is concentrated upon *one* supreme event of this sort, and upon the struggle to maintain intact the early ideals. It is focussed upon *one* sweeping invasion from the south; whereas subsequently we shall find two movements that are of the utmost significance for the historical development of Israel, and, in certain respects, resemble the events which are assigned to the pre-monarchical period. They are of the ninth and seventh–sixth centuries B.C. respectively. Moreover, in the sixth and fifth centuries, we shall meet with another 'Exodus'—this time from Babylon; and there will be ecclesiastical and other vicissitudes which, in turn, at least find a parallel in the narratives of the earlier period. And while this second 'Exodus' is, in a sense, an echo of the first (Is. xi, 15 *sq.*; xliii, 16–19; xlviii, 20 *sq.*), the account of the Exodus from Egypt and the Conquest is, as we have seen, conflicting and confused, and, in the view of biblical critics, the constituent narratives *in their present form* are later than the ninth century, and partly even later than the sixth (cf. pp. 356, 363).

Although some very important traditions can be recognized, and it cannot be doubted that some knowledge was retained of the history of the second millennium B.C., we cannot be confident that events in Palestine ran along the lines laid down in our records. For the early history of Palestine the O.T. cannot be used as it stands. The ordinary histories and text-books are necessarily obliged to utilize the fruits of modern research, and present each some particular and possible reconstruction. But such are the internal difficulties and the unavoidable differences of opinion that it has seemed to the present writer undesirable to attempt yet another reconstruction which the progress of archaeological discovery might any day radically modify or overthrow. Much

can be gleaned from an independent survey of contemporary and external material. Moreover, we gain a great deal from the O.T. which has a meaning for history, could we fit it into a historical framework. But the internal complexities of the O.T. are such that every estimate of the course of Israelite history must take them into account, and fresh external evidence is needed for our interpretation of them. If much remains unknown and problematical, and we seem to lose much of the familiar biblical history, the fact remains that the so-called 'historical' books—the 'Former Prophets,' as they were styled, in contrast to the 'prophetical' books proper—were written under the influence of specific religious and other ideas. Truth of idea rather than of fact is the characteristic feature of the biblical history; and the ideas, being really independent of and separable from the form in which they have been expressed, are permanent, and capable of re-expression[1].

[1] Owing to the literary structure of the biblical narratives the problems of the earlier periods cannot be severed from those of the later. Among them is that of the extreme importance of the Edomite or South Palestinian *bloc* for the rise of the Judaean monarchy (pp. 366 *sq.*, 389 *sq.*, 393). This was shown most completely and convincingly by E. Meyer in 1906 (*Die Israeliten und ihre Nachbarstämme*; cf. J. Skinner, *Genesis*, p. 437), but an analysis of the history of Saul and David makes it doubtful whether the evidence actually refers to the history of Palestine in the twelfth-eleventh centuries. In any case, the conclusion reached in the preceding pages, that our sources are too imperfect for any consecutive and detailed account of the history, is confirmed when, in due course, we come to the monarchical period (vol. III). There we shall meet with much that connects it with the Amarna period (cf. p. 351 above) and with conditions among the surrounding peoples, and we shall find situations the cause of which we are unable to trace. It is a degraded Yahwism against which the prophets have to contend, and they presuppose conditions which do not lie before us in the records; for the records, as a whole, are later than the religious reforms of the great prophets, and reflect later conceptions of the earlier life and thought. As has already become evident (p. 402 *sq.*), 'archaeology' and 'criticism' combine to require a restatement of the historical development of Ancient Palestine; and a more careful historical criticism is necessary before the very intricate problems of the literary structure can be at all successfully handled (cf. p. 375).

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

Abh.	Abhandlungen.
Abh. K.M.	Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes.
A.J.A.	American Journal of Archaeology.
A.J. Ph.	American Journal of Philology.
A.J.S.L.	American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures.
Anc. Eg.	Ancient Egypt.
A.S.A.E.	Annales du Service des antiquités de l'Égypte.
Ath. Mitt.	Mitteilungen des deutschen arch. Inst., Athenische Abteilung.
B. z. Ass.	Beiträge zur Assyriologie und semitischen Sprachwissenschaft.
B.C.H.	Bulletin de Correspondance hellénique.
B.I.C.	Bulletin de l'Institut français d'archéologie orientale au Caire.
Bay. S.B.	Sitzungsberichte d. bayerischen Akad. d. Wissenschaften.
Berl. S.B.	Sitzungsberichte d. preuss. Akad. d. Wissenschaften zu Berlin.
Biblica	Biblica. Commentarii editi a Pontificio Instituto Biblico, Roma.
B.S.A.	Annual of the British School at Athens.
B.S.R.	Papers of the British School at Rome.
Bull. d. I.	Bullettino dell' Instituto.
C.A.H.	Cambridge Ancient History.
C.I.G.	Corpus Inscriptionum Graecarum.
C.I.L.	Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum.
C.I.S.	Corpus Inscriptionum Semiticarum.
C.J.	Classical Journal.
C.Q.	Classical Quarterly.
C.R.	Classical Review.
C.R. Ac. Inscr.	Comptes rendus de l'Académie des Inscriptions.
D.B.	Dictionary of the Bible (J. Hastings, Edinburgh, 1898).
E. Bi.	Encyclopaedia Biblica.
E. Brit.	Encyclopaedia Britannica. Ed. XI.
E.H.R.	English Historical Review.
E.R.E.	Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics.
Ἐφ. Ἀρχ.	Ἐφημερὶς Ἀρχαιολογική.
F.H.G.	C. Müller, Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum.
G.G.A.	Göttingische Gelehrte Anzeigen.
Geogr. Z.	Geographische Zeitschrift.
Head H.N.	Head, Historia Numorum, 2nd Ed. 1912.
Herm.	Hermes.
I.G.F.	Indogermanische Forschungen.
J.A.O.S.	Journal of the American Oriental Society.
J.A.	Journal Asiatique.
J.B.S.	Journal of Biblical Studies.
J.D.A.I.	Jahrbuch des deutschen archäologischen Instituts.
J.E.A.	Journal of Egyptian Archaeology.
J.H.S.	Journal of Hellenic Studies.
J. Man. E.O.S.	Journal of the Manchester Egyptian and Oriental Society.
J.R.A.I.	Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute.
J.R.A.S.	Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society.
J.R.S.	Journal of Roman Studies.

J.S.O.R.	Journal of the Society of Oriental Research.
K.A.H.	Keilinschrifttexte aus Assur historischen Inhalts.
Klio.	Klio (Beiträge zur alten Geschichte).
Liv. A.A.	Liverpool Annals of Archaeology.
M.B.B.A.	Monatsbericht der Berliner Akademie.
M.D.O.G.	Mitteilungen der deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft.
M.D.P.V.	Mitteilungen des deutschen Palästinavereins.
M.V.A.G.	Mitteilungen der vorderasiatischen Gesellschaft.
Mon. d. I.	Monumenti Antichi dell' Instituto.
N.J. Kl. Alt.	Neue Jahrbücher für das klassische Altertum.
N.J.P.	Neue Jahrbücher für Philologie.
N.S.A.	Notizie degli Scavi di Antichità (Atti d. r. Accad. dei Lincei).
Num. Chr.	Numismatic Chronicle.
Num. Z.	Numismatische Zeitschrift.
O.L.Z.	Orientalistische Literaturzeitung.
P.E.F.	Palestine Exploration Fund.
Phil.	Philologus.
P.S.B.A.	Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archaeology.
P.W.	Pauly-Wissowa, Real-Encyclopädie der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft.
Πρ.	Πρακτικά.
Q.S.	Quarterly Statement(s).
Rec. Trav.	Recueil de Travaux relatifs à la philologie et à l'archéologie égyptienne et assyrienne.
Rev. A.	Revue archéologique.
Rev. Ass.	Revue d'Assyriologie.
Rev. Bib.	Revue biblique internationale.
Rev. Eg.	Revue égyptologique.
Rev. E.G.	Revue des études grecques.
Rev. H.	Revue historique.
Rev. N.	Revue numismatique.
Rh. Mus.	Rheinisches Museum für Philologie.
Riv. Fil.	Rivista di Filologia.
Riv. N.O.	Rivista nuova orientale.
Röm. Mitth.	Mitteilungen des deutschen arch. Inst., Römische Abteilung.
R.V.	Revised Version.
R.V. mg.	Revised Version margin.
S.B.	Sitzungsberichte.
Syria.	Syria: Revue d'art oriental et d'archéologie.
T.S.B.A.	Transactions of the Society of Biblical Archaeology.
Wien S.B.	Sitzungsberichte d. Akad. d. Wissenschaften in Wien.
Wien St.	Wiener Studien.
W.Z.K.M.	Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes.
Z.A.	Zeitschrift für Assyriologie.
Z. Aeg.	Zeitschrift für aegyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde.
Z.A.T.W.	Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft.
Z.D.M.G.	Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft.
Z.D.P.V.	Zeitschrift des deutschen Palästina-Vereins.
Z.E.	Zeitschrift für Ethnologie.
Z.G. f. E.	Zeitschrift der Gesellschaft für Erdkunde.
Z.N.	Zeitschrift für Numismatik.

CHAPTER XIV

THE RISE OF ISRAEL

For the 'external' evidence see the bibliography to the preceding chapter. The 'internal' evidence concerns the Old Testament as a whole, and is dealt with in the critical literature on the Old Testament, biblical history and religion, etc., for summaries of which see vol. III (Bibliographies).

1. O.T. Criticism

There are four classics:

Wellhausen, Julius. Prolegomena to the History of Israel. With a reprint of the article 'Israel' from the E. Brit. 9th ed. Translated by J. Sutherland Black and Allan Menzies; preface by W. R. Smith, 1885. (The German original in 1878 marks the inauguration of the modern 'critical' position.)

Smith, William Robertson. The O.T. in the Jewish Church. A course of lectures on Biblical Criticism. 1st ed. 1881; 2nd ed. 1892.

Kuenen, Abraham. An historico-critical Inquiry into the Origin and Composition of the Hexateuch (Pentateuch and Book of Joshua). Transl. from the Dutch (2nd ed. 1885) by P. H. Wicksteed, 1886.

Driver, Samuel Rolles. An Introduction to the Literature of the O.T. 1st ed. 1891; 9th ed. 1913.

2. General Introductory Literature on Biblical Criticism

Abbott, Lyman. The Life and Literature of the Ancient Hebrews. 1901.

Bevan, A. A. Historical Methods in the O.T. Cambridge Biblical Essays (1909), pp. 1–19.

Briggs, C. A. General Introduction to the Study of Holy Scripture. The principles, methods, history and results of its several departments and of the whole. Edinburgh, 1899.

Chapman, A. T. An Introduction to the Pentateuch. Cambridge, 1911.

Cook, S. A. The Present Stage of O.T. Research. Camb. Bib. Essays (1909), pp. 54–89.

Driver, S. R. The Critical Study of the O.T. (Essays for The Times, No. 21, 1890.)

—— and Kirkpatrick, A. F. The Higher Criticism. 1905.

Jordan, W. G. Biblical Criticism and Modern Thought, or, The place of the O.T. Documents in the Life of To-day. 1909.

McNeile, A. H. Deuteronomy, its place in Revelation. 1912.

Peake, A. S. The Bible. 1913.

Simpson, D. C. Pentateuchal Criticism. 1914.

Smith, Sir G. A. Modern Criticism and the Preaching of the O.T. 1901.

Smith, H. P. Essays in Biblical Interpretation. Boston, U.S.A., 1921.

Sprott, T. H. Modern Study of the O.T. and Inspiration. Cambridge, 1909.

The 'conservative' and 'anti-critical' literature includes, in particular, the works of J. Dahse (Textkritische Materialien zur Hexateuch-frage. Giessen, 1912; see in reply J. Skinner, The Divine Names in Genesis, 1914), M. G. Kyle, W. Moeller, H. M. Wiener, and especially J. Robertson (The Early Religion of Israel, 1892), and J. Orr (The Problem of the O.T. considered with reference to recent criticism, 1905); also articles in the Bibliotheca Sacra and the Princeton Theolog. Review.

New developments in the literary criticism of the Hexateuch are noted in the commentaries. Special mention may be made of:

Eerdmans, B. D. Alttest. Studien. 1. Die Komposition der Genesis. Giessen, 1908.
Eichrodt, W. Die Quellen d. Genesis von neuem untersucht. Giessen, 1916.
Eissfeldt, O. Hexateuch-Synopse. Leipzig, 1923.
Smend, R. Die Erzählung d. Hexateuch, auf ihre Quellen untersucht. Berlin, 1912.

3. Archaeology and Criticism

Bennett, W. H. Contemporary Review, April, 1906, pp. 518 *sqq.*
Bevan, A. A. Critical Review, 1897, pp. 406 *sqq.*; 1898, pp. 131 *sqq.*
Cook, S. A. Expositor, 1906, June, pp. 524–43.
Driver, S. R. Authority and Archaeology (ed. Hogarth), pp. 1–152. 1899.
Gray, G. B. Expositor, May, 1898, pp. 337 *sqq.*
Peake, A. S. Inaugural Lectures by Members of the Faculty of Theology of Manchester University. 1905.

See also on this subject the Commentaries on Genesis by S. R. Driver (Westminster Series, 1904), H. E. Ryle (Cambridge Bible, 1914), J. Skinner (Internat. Crit. Comm., Edinburgh, 1910), Gunkel (German, 1922), and Böhl (Dutch, 1923); and on Exodus by A. H. McNeile (Westm. Ser., 1908), and Driver (Cambridge Bible, 1911).

4. The Exodus

Cook, S. A. Art. Exodus (The) in E. Brit.
Gardiner, A. H. The Delta Residence of the Pharaohs. J.E.A. v, 1918, pp. 127, 177, 242 *sqq.*
—— The Geography of the Exodus. Recueil Champollion, 1922, pp. 203–15.
Gressmann, H. Mose und seine Zeit: Ein Kommentar zu den Mose-Sagen. Göttingen, 1913.
Knight, G. A. F. Nile and Jordan: the Archaeological and Historical Interrelations between Egypt and Canaan. 1921. (Very full bibliography.)
Mallon, A. Les Hébreux en Égypte. Orientalia, III. Rome, 1921.
Miketta, K. Der Pharao des Auszuges. Bibl. Stud. VIII, 2. Freiburg, 1903.
Naville, E. J.E.A. II, 195. (On the stele of Merneptah.)
Peet, T. Eric. Egypt and the O.T. 1922.
Petrie, Sir W. M. F. Egypt and Israel. 1923.
Spiegelberg, W. Der Aufenthalt Israels in Aegypten. Strassburg, 1904.
Vernes, M. Sinai contre Kades. Paris, 1915.
Wiener, H. M. The date of the Exodus. Bibliotheca Sacra, 1916, pp. 454–80.

5. Special Works

Baentsch, B. Altorientalischer und Israelitischer Monotheismus: ein Wort zur Revision der entwicklungsgeschicht. Auffassung d. israel. Religionsgeschichte. Tübingen, 1906.
Burney, C. F. A Theory of the Development of Israelite Religion in Early Times. J. Theol. Stud., April, 1908, pp. 321–52.
—— Israel's Settlement in Canaan; the Biblical Tradition and its Historical Background. Schweich Lecture. 3rd ed. 1921.
Cook, S. A. Critical Notes on O.T. History: the Traditions of Saul and David. 1907. (Reprinted from J.Q.R., 1905–7.)
—— Simeon and Levi: the Problem of the O.T. Am. J. Theol. XIII (1909), 370–88.

Cook, S. A. Articles in the E. Brit. on Genesis, Jews, Palestine (History), and the several tribes of Israel.
Eerdmans, B. D. Alttestamentliche Studien. II. Die Vorgeschichte Israels. Giessen, 1908.
Gordon, A. R. The Early Traditions of Genesis. 1907.
Gray, G. B. Art. Tribes in E. Bi.
Gunkel, H. The Legends of Genesis. Transl. by W. H. Carruth, from the Introduction to the Commentary on Genesis. Chicago, 1907.
Hogg, H. W. Articles on the several tribes of Israel in E. Bi.
Kittel, E. Geschichte des Volkes Israel. I. Quellenkunde und Geschichte der Zeit bis zum Tode Josuas. 5th ed. Gotha, 1923. II. Das Volk in Kanaan. 4th ed. Gotha, 1922.
Langdon, S. H. The Habiru and the Hebrews. Exp. Times, XXXI (1920), 324–9.
Lehmann-Haupt, C. F. Israel: seine Entwicklung im Rahmen der Weltgeschichte. Tübingen, 1911.
Luckenbill, D. D. Israel's Origins. Amer. J. Theol. XXII (1918), 24–53.
Meek, T. J. Some Religious Origins of the Hebrews. A.J.S.L. XXXVII (1921), 101–31.
—— A proposed Reconstruction of Early Hebrew History. Amer. J. Theol. XXIV (1920), 209 *sqq*.
Meyer, Ed. and B. Luther. Die Israeliten und ihre Nachbarstämme. Halle a. S. 1906. (Important.)
Paton, L. B. Israel's Conquest of Canaan. J.B.L. XXXII (1913), 1–53. (A good summary of views.)
—— Religion of Gezer and the Israelite Conquest. J.B.L. XXXII, 251.
—— Canaanite Influence on Palestine. Amer. J. Theol. 1914, p. 204.
Salaman, R. N. Racial Origins of Jewish Types. Transactions of the Jewish Hist. Society of England, IX, 1922, pp. 163–84 (with 12 plates). See also Journal of Genetics, I (1911), 273–92; and the Eugenics Review, Oct. 1911.
Sayce, A. H. Early Israel and the surrounding Nations. 1899.
—— Patriarchal Palestine. 1912.
Seligman, C. G. The Physical Characters of the Arabs. J.R.A.I. XLVII (1917), 214–37.
Smith, H. P. Moses and Monotheism. Amer. J. Theol. XII (1908), 444–54.
Smith, J. M. P. Some Problems in the Early History of Hebrew Religion. A.J.S.L. XXXII (1916), 81–97.
—— Southern Influences upon Hebrew Prophecy. A.J.S.L. XXXV (1918), 1–19.
Stade, B. Die Entstehung des Volkes Israel. Giessen, 1899.
Steuernagel, C. Die Einwanderung d. israel. Stämme in Kanaan. 1901.
Vincent, H. Les noms de Jérusalem. Memnon, VI, 88–124.
Weinheimer, H. Z.D.M.G. LXVI, 365–88. (On the entrance of the Hebrews and Israelites into Canaan.)
Wiener, H. M. The Religion of Moses. Bibliotheca Sacra, 1919, pp. 323–58.
Winckler, H. Geschichte Israels, I. Berlin, 1895.

6. Ideas of Right, etc. (above, pp. 397 *sqq.*)

Carnoy, A. J. J.A.O.S. XXXVI, 307 *sq*. (On *rita*, etc.)
Carpenter, E. Early Conceptions of Law in Nature. Hibbert J., July, 1923, pp. 711–24.
Cook, S. A. J. Theol. Stud. IX (1908), 632 n. (On the Hebrew word for righteousness.)
Cornford, F. M. From Religion to Philosophy (pp. 172 *sqq*.). 1912.

Davids, T. W. Rhys. Cosmic Law in Ancient Thought. Proc. of the Brit. Acad. (Nov. 1917), VIII.

Drummond, J. The Righteousness of God. Hibbert Journ. I. 1902, pp. 83 *sqq.*

Hall, H. R. Anc. Hist. of Near East (p. 304, n. 3; cf. p. 298).

—— J.E.A. 1923, p. 257 *sq.*

Harrison, Jane. Themis: a Study of the Social Origins of Greek Religion (p. 526 *sq.*). Cambridge, 1912.

Levy, I. Divinités Égyptiennes chez les Grecs et les Sémites. Cinquantenaire de l'Éc. pour Hautes Études (pp. 271–88).

Meyer, E. Geschichte des Altertums, I, 2 (Index, *svv.* Arta, Ma'at).

Moore, G. F. History of Religions, I (Index, *svv.* Asha, Rita).